

BR
I
C559

CHURCH HISTORY



Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY JAMES CRAVEN, 1890; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1938

ROBERT H. E. HASTINGS	President
CHARLES LYTTELTON	Vice-President
MATTHEW SPINKA	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
ROBERT FORTINERSON	Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WILLIAM DAVID SCHNEIDER
MICHAEL WARREN SWEENEY
CONRAD HENRY MCNEILAN
FRANCIS WILLIAM LOHSECKE
JOHN THOMAS McNEIL.

WILHELM PAUCK
HENRY WALLACE SCHNEIDER
ROLAND H. BAINTON
F. W. BUCKLER
E. R. HARDY, JR.

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
ROBERT H. E. HASTINGS, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BLOOM, INDIANA

ADVERTISING AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Church History is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, and December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is three dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. In foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5737 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History.

Comments, interesting contributions, book reviews, and all other editorial matter should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5737 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Change of mailing address and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 8, 1924, at the post office at Bloom, Indiana, and March 5, 1928.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS, *ex officio*

VOL. VII

MARCH, 1938

No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING <i>Herbert Wallace Schneider</i>	3
SOME ESSAYS ON TOLERATION IN LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND <i>Charles F. Mullett</i>	24
"THE NAKED TRUTH": A PLEA FOR CHURCH UNITY <i>Ethyn W. Kirby</i>	45
MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE SOCIETY AND OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER, 1937	62
BOOK REVIEWS:	74
MCNEILL, J. T.: <i>Christian Hope for World Society</i>	Roland H. Bainton.
OESTERLEY, W. O. E.: <i>Judaism and Christianity, Vol. I., The Age of Transition</i>	E. F. Scott.
CASH, W. W.: <i>Christendom and Islam</i>	W. D. Schermerhorn.

C O N T E N T S

- ZERNOV, N.: *Moscow the Third Rome* Matthew Spinka.
MOREY, DOM A.: *Bartholomew of Exeter* W. E. L. Smith.
CURTAYNE, A.: *St. Catherine of Siena* M. H. Shepherd Jr.
PENDRILL, C.: *Old Parish Life in London* J. T. McNeill.
MOZLEY, J. F.: *William Tyndale* M. M. Knappen.
SIPPEL, T.: *Werdentes Quakertum* Rufus M. Jones.
HENDERSON, J. D.: *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland* W. K. Jordan.
LYONS, T.: *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-1639* M. M. Knappen.
JOY, J. R.: *John Wesley's Awakening* Kathleen MacArthur.
NIEBUHR, H. R.: *The Kingdom of God in America*. R. H. Nichols.
HARRIS, R. V.: *Charles Inglis, Missionary, Loyalist, Bishop* William W. Manross.
STOWE, W. H.: *The Life and Letters of Bishop William White* J. A. Muller.
CLARK, E. T.: *The Small Sects in America* Merril E. Gaddis.
KAUFFMAN, DANIEL: *Mennonite Cyclopedic Dictionary* C. Henry Smith.
STOUDT, J. J.: *Consider the Lilies How They Grow* Roland H. Bainton.
BEARDSLEY, F. G.: *A Mighty Winner of Souls: Charles G. Finney* Mervin M. Deems.
MARTIN, M. A.: *The Catholic Church on the Nebraska Frontier* Charles J. Kennedy.
STANLEY, R.: *The Archer of Paradise* Clifford M. Drury.
KELLEY, C. and BIRNEY, H.: *Holy Murder* Clifford M. Drury.
DRURY, C. M.: *Marcus Whitman* C. B. Goodykoontz.
MULLER, J. A.: *Apostle of China: S. I. J. Schereschewsky* K. S. Latourette.
FÜLOP-MILLER, R.: *Leo XIII and Our Times* J. P. McGowan.
HALPERIN, S. W.: *The Separation of Church and State in Italian Thought from Cavour to Mussolini* Herbert Wallace Schneider.
MONSMA, PETER H.: *Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation* W. Pauck.

gift
L. G. Vander Velde
3-7-48
v. 7 no. 1: 4

THE INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING¹

HERBERT WALLACE SCHNEIDER
Columbia University, New York City

William Ellery Channing was an American Schleiermacher, standing at the turning point from the Enlightenment to Transcendentalism, and, like Schleiermacher, he has been treated by historians as the initiator of a movement. He is understood in terms of what followed him. According to Mr. Van Wyck Brooks, he represents the budding of New England. I wish to reverse the perspective and to present Channing as the culmination of the American Enlightenment. In the Revolutionary generation three distinct systems of thought, three historically separate faiths were flourishing; for want of better terms I shall call them rationalism, pietism, and republicanism. Channing, as I shall attempt to show, inherited each of these faiths, understood the issues at stake, felt the struggle intimately, and attempted to formulate a synthesis of all three. His humanitarianism may therefore fittingly be studied as the summation of the ideals of the American Enlightenment. If I had time, I would follow up the negative side of the argument and show that Channing participated only slightly in the thought of the coming generation, the generation from 1830 to 1860, and that he was, on the whole, not willingly a prophet of Transcendentalism. In his last years, when he saw dimly what was to come, he was repelled by much of it and looked back almost wistfully to the faith of his fathers.

It is none the less a just fate that overtook him, for by principle and by habit Channing was forward-looking. He did not attempt a literal synthesis of pietism, of natural religion, and of republicanism, but his mind was molded by all three and gave to all three a new and stimulating expression that transformed them from a mere heritage of the eighteenth century into the guiding principles of the nineteenth. For Channing

¹ The presidential address delivered at the meeting of the Society in Chester, Pa., on December 28, 1937.

was one of the first New England preachers to turn decidedly from the past to the future. He had sufficiently mastered the heritage of the Enlightenment to be willing to take it for granted and to turn toward the practical problems it suggested. "God designs us for activity, pursuit of ends, efficiency. Action originating in God, and attended with the consciousness of his favor, is the highest source of enjoyment."²

And to a young candidate for the ministry he wrote:

I wish there were a theological institution in which young men might be educated who have no taste for philosophy, and no great respect for a theology which must be dug out of lexicons and antiquities, but who desire to get into the heart of religion and use it for the elevation of the people, for the redress of all wrong.³

Nevertheless, we must remember that, though Channing had this thoroughly practical conception of religion, he was himself not practical. He was enough of a child of the Enlightenment to prefer to preach the gospel of reform rather than to practise it. He gave to purely practical religion an adequate theoretical basis.

Channing's early life and thought were dominated by a pietistic⁴ environment. The legend has grown up, started by Channing himself, that his love of religious liberty came to him naturally in his birth-place, Newport, Rhode Island, that he inherited it, so to speak, directly from Roger Williams. The Newport of his boyhood, however, was dominated theologically by Samuel Hopkins, the champion of "consistent Calvinism," whose followers even at that time were being called Hopkinsians and whose faith that his own system was the only true gospel was so strong that it bore the fruits of sectarian fanaticism and intolerance. Channing's maternal grandfather, Ellery, was a staunch believer in the New Light theology, and his father, a merchant of Newport, was a near neighbor of Dr. Hopkins himself. Channing writes:

I was attached to Dr. Hopkins chiefly by his theory of disinter-

² William Henry Channing: *Memoir of William Ellery Channing with Extracts from his Correspondence and Manuscripts* (Boston, 1848), I, 189. Subsequent references unless otherwise stated are to this *Memoir*.

³ *Memoir*, II, 284.

⁴ I shall use pietism as a synonym for Edwardeanism and the New Light movement. To justify this in detail would take me too far afield and would require me to draw liberally on unpublished researches on Jonathan Edwards by W. J. B. Edgar. In general, however, the similarity and direct relation between European pietism and the American New Lights is evident enough without further exposition.

INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF W. E. CHANNING 5

estedness. I had studied with great delight during my college life the philosophy of Hutcheson, and the Stoical morality, and these had prepared me for the noble, self-sacrificing doctrines of Dr. Hopkins.⁵

Channing was even suspected of Hopkinsian leanings at his probation examination before the Cambridge Association.

In his later years, confused somewhat by the smoke of battle, Channing gave the impression that he revolted almost instinctively against Calvinism or turned to it in a fit of depression. He wrote, for example, "There was a time when I verged towards Calvinism, for ill health and depression gave me a dark view of things."⁶

It appears to be true that Hopkins made no favorable impression on Channing as a boy and that it was not until after his return to Newport from college that he began to appreciate the departures of the New Light theology from conventional Calvinism and the true import of Hopkins' thought.⁷

He turned to Hopkins, not in the darkness of depression, but because he realized that, though the old theologian was harsh and polemical, his system was the most "noble" and enlightened philosophy in New England. The best evidence that Channing had taken Hopkins seriously is his tribute to Hopkins in his Sermon at the Dedication of the Unitarian Church in Newport in 1836, a tribute which shocked his Unitarian hearers and was interpreted by them as sheer "generosity." It reveals, on the contrary, a just estimate of the aims and fundamentals of New Light theology. "I need not be ashamed to confess the deep impression which his system made on my youthful mind. I am grateful to this stern teacher for turning my thoughts and heart to the claims and majesty of impartial, universal benevolence."⁸

Channing here pointed out the boldness of Hopkins in reconciling Calvinism to Platonic moral philosophy and natural religion. Beginning with the generally accepted idea of the pursuit of happiness as man's natural good and of pleasure as

⁵ *Memoir*, I, 137. Cf. the remark of the Hon. D. A. White of Salem, who was in the class above Channing at college and knew him well. "About the time he commenced preaching, he spoke of Dr. Hopkins with warm esteem, both as a friend and a theologian, dwelling with particular emphasis on the strong feature of benevolence which marked both his character and his divinity, and observing very pointedly, that 'those who were called Hopkinsians . . . appeared to know little of him or of his true theological views,'" (I, 161).

⁶ *Memoir*, I, 161.

⁷ See also *Memoir*, I, 33.

⁸ *Memoir*, I, 142.

the measure of happiness, Hopkins argued that God, or general being, is the *natural* good of man, because He is the source of the most lasting, everlasting happiness; that in loving God man is doing what most pleases him and therefore is most truly active when he most completely surrenders to the divine sovereignty. The distinguishing mark of this holy love is its disinterestedness, its complete satisfaction in the excellence of its object. Hence God in exhibiting disinterestedness, or a reign of justice and law, is revealing his glory and perfection. In condemning Adam, our representative head as sinners, to infinite punishment and redeeming us with an infinite sacrifice, He lays the necessary basis in justice for the exercise of holy love and grace. Hopkins, even more than Edwards before him, studied Platonists like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, as well as the natural law school, particularly Locke and Grotius, and without fear tried to meet them on their own ground. The cornerstone of this attempt was the doctrine that disinterested benevolence, or holy love, is qualitatively distinguished from secular love; it is "true virtue," and its only and natural object is God. Philosophically the significance of pietism is this reconciliation of Plato, Calvin, and Locke in its conception of an empirical definition or "sense" of the divine beauty. Jonathan Edwards, having identified secular morality with enlightened self-love, as the Cartesians had done, had insisted that piety, or holy love, could therefore not be natural; its origin as well as its object must be God. Hopkins, on the other hand, following the newer secular moralists and their doctrine of rational disinterestedness, or the natural love of justice, came very near to doing what Channing finally did, identifying virtue and piety. Hopkins identified piety and Platonic love but insisted that moral virtue was merely a means to, not the essence of, the love of God.

This pietistic doctrine of the distinctive quality of holiness and the pietistic cultivation of the *sense* or feeling for the divine remained the dominant theme of Channing's thought to the end. It made doctrinaire Unitarianism distasteful to him. Though he defended the Unitarian cause when its rights and liberties were threatened, he preferred not to call himself a Unitarian nor to engage in polemics concerning historical Christian doctrines. And this was due not only to his dislike of sectarianism but even more to his New Light evangelicalism. He had no quarrel with "rational" Christians, but, above all, Christians

must practise holiness; they must prove by their love of God that the human soul is naturally capable of disinterested benevolence, and this practice of virtue or piety was to him essentially unworldly. He even identified it frequently with the spirit of martyrdom.

In short, I wish to emphasize two points: first, that Channing's Platonic idealism came to him through Calvinistic pietism, and that he had already reacted against Locke's empiricism and rationalism before he learned of Coleridge, Kant, and the growth of Transcendentalism in general. Secondly, I wish to emphasize that Channing's quarrel was more with the so-called moderate Calvinists, who defended Calvinism as orthodoxy, than with the New Light pietists, who defended neo-Calvinism as rational. Channing was closer in spirit to Andover than to Princeton. The Harvard liberals, it will be recalled, were at this time engaged in a triangular battle with the New Lights and the Presbyterians. The Andover New Lights, though politically allied with the Moderates, with Morse and his Presbyterian friends, were really engaged in a losing fight against them for the privilege of defending Calvinism. The Harvard liberals took pleasure in exposing and exaggerating the differences between Princeton and Andover.⁹ Channing, had he taken an active part in this struggle, would certainly have welcomed what has only recently taken place, a union of Harvard and Andover, a rapprochement between liberalism and pietism.

I turn now to a second general strain in Channing's thought, his liberalism or republicanism. By this latter term I mean to suggest his civic or social conception of virtue. Channing's liberalism came less from Rhode Island,¹⁰ as I have al-

⁹ See "Review (by Horace Holley) of *A Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism*, by the Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely," in *The General Repository and Review*, III, April 1813.

¹⁰ Channing was in the habit of identifying his Rhode Island environment, which except for his earliest years was only his summer home, with the love of nature. And the communion with nature he identified, for obvious reasons which were not philosophical, with freedom. It is easy to exaggerate this element in Channing's sentiments. Mr. Van Wyk Brooks, for example, writes: "Channing was a lover of lakes and mountains. He had studied their contours under various skies; he knew all the effects of atmosphere, of mist and cloud and dry and watery sunlight. The grandeur of New Hampshire, the gentle, pastoral beauty of Vermont had swayed and attuned his feelings. He could form a friendship with a mountain; and he knew the interminable depths of the virgin forests as well as he knew the ocean, beside whose crashing waves he had leaped for joy. These temperamental sympathies had drawn him to the new German *Naturphilosophie*." (*The Flowering of New England*, 104.) Is there really any evidence that his love of scenery had anything to do with his *Naturphilosophie*? Cf. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody's *Reminiscences of Rev. Wm. Ellery Channing*, D. D. (Boston, 1880), 61.

ready suggested, than from Harvard and Virginia.

When he was twelve years old he was sent to his uncle at New London, Connecticut, where he was to prepare for college. Presumably he was intended for Yale. His father had been a devoted member of Ezra Stiles' congregation in Newport and very probably had intended to send his son to Yale now that Stiles was its president. But it happened that while he was at New London his father died. His uncle, the Rev. Henry Channing, though he had been a tutor at Yale, was becoming increasingly critical of its Presbyterian leanings and increasingly liberal in his theology. In 1806 he was dismissed, being suspected of Unitarianism.¹¹ I have no direct evidence, but it seems highly probable that it was through his uncle's influence that he went, after two years (1794), not to Yale but to Harvard.

At Harvard he discovered Edinburgh. Historians of American thought would do well to emphasize the important rôle that the philosophers of Scotland played in the American Enlightenment.¹² A generation or two later Scottish philosophy, represented by McCosh at Princeton and Noah Porter at Yale,

¹¹ His letters to Jedediah Morse certainly do not mince words. He was accustomed to address them to "The Rev'd Jedediah Morse, Bishop of the Church, Charlestow." And the following excerpts express his sentiments. "New London, April 8, 1795 . . . Laus Deo, France triumphs and Holland is delivered. The present day is so loaded with momentous events, that my heart exults in having a portion of time at the close of the 18th century . . . Upon theological subjects as far as relates to the government of the church, we are entirely dissonant. Yes, my dear Sir, I assure you that it was with astonishment I read the following paragraph in your last—'We are now too independent—much more so than the churches were in purer ages of Christianity.' What you mean by purer ages of Christianity, I do not know . . . Permit me to observe that you have lived among Presbyterians, until you have become accustomed to their government; but with me it is clearly altogether of human invention . . . November 12, 1796 . . . I now ask, who has authorized a church or a body of churches to divest themselves of that power which was given them separately, by the Head of the church? Though I ask the question, it is only that you may be led to consider the ground upon which you are about to step: for I assure you that I am confident, the question can not be fairly answered by the advocate for a coalition of churches to possess authority paramount to the individual churches.—But I must stop my pen, regretting that I have expended so much time and ink to no purpose: for, honestly, my friend, I do not expect to convince you of mistake. You have mounted your hobby-horse and you may e'en ride on; but I do not say as a man said in another case—ride on to the D--l . . ."

¹² "It is a commonplace that the America of the nineteenth century was culturally dependent upon England. It is more accurate to say that it was culturally allied with Scotland." (William Charvat: *The Origins of American Critical Thought* (University of Pennsylvania, 1936), 29.) This is certainly still more true of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Even German philosophy entered New England (and England, for that matter) largely via Scotland. Thomas Brown, for example, wrote a review of Kant's philosophy in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1803, which was long before George Ticknor and his friends were induced to go to Germany by reading Madame de Staël.

became a byword for conservative, academic thought of the driest temper. But on the Revolutionary generation Edinburgh exercised a revolutionary influence. Much of the liberalism that has been attributed to Locke, to French influence, to Coleridge and the Germans, came in directly from Scotland. The *Edinburgh Review* and the *Edinburgh Cyclopaedia* enjoyed enormous prestige in New England. Hutcheson, Hume, Lord Kames, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, Thomas Brown, Dugald Stewart—these were very familiar philosophical names in Revolutionary America. The Presbyterians seem to have been strangely, if not scandalously, indifferent to this literature. John Witherspoon¹³ almost succeeded in introducing a mild dose of it into Princeton, but in academic and theological circles in general the Edinburgh school was soon crowded out by Reid and the less radical philosophers of Aberdeen, among whom Stewart should be reckoned, though he later went to Edinburgh. It was the educated laymen, the politicians, lawyers, and physicians, who were chiefly responsible for the spread of Scottish radicalism in America.

Hutcheson was regarded as fairly safe in academic circles, and at Harvard his *Enquiry* supplanted Henry Moore's *Enchiridion* even before the middle of the eighteenth century.¹⁴ And as early as 1739 William Hooper, when he was accused of Arminianism, explained that his opinions were due to "his education in a Scotch university."¹⁵

Professor David Tappan of Harvard, under whose influence Channing came, was himself decidedly influenced by Hutcheson and by moral liberalism in general. Though kindly disposed toward the New Lights, if not one of them, he made a vigorous defense of the performance of secular moral duties as independent of regeneration and as objectively grounded in the "fitness" of things regardless of piety or impiety in the motive. His Fast-day Sermons, too, were notable for their civic interpretation of New Light theology. On the same day, for example, that Jedediah Morse was trumping up the "Illuminati" scare in his Fast-day Sermon for 1798 at Charleston, Tappan

¹³ In his *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* Witherspoon said: "An author of New England says moral philosophy is just reducing infidelity to a system" (p. 367).

¹⁴ See Benjamin Rand: "Philosophical Instruction in Harvard University," *Harvard Graduates Magazine* (September 1928), 37.

¹⁵ See Francis Albert Christie: "The Beginnings of Arminianism in New England," *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, second series III (1912), 157.

in Boston preached as follows: "Christian patriotism is nothing else than general benevolence embracing, with peculiar sensibility and active energy, that portion of mankind, to which our capacity of usefulness eminently reaches."¹⁶ This sounds like Channing himself and must have given some concern to Morse, who had been instrumental in getting Tappan to Harvard. Unlike Channing, Tappan taught that the performance of duty for duty's sake is not "true virtue," which presupposes "rational piety" and love of God's excellence; but he paved the way for Channing by teaching that Christianity was introduced for the "moral perfection and happiness of man,"¹⁷ as well as by teaching that "general benevolence" is identical with "love of our neighbor," "devotion by each member of the community to the interest of all," or "social virtue."¹⁸

Through Professor Tappan and Harvard in general, Channing discovered Hutcheson and then the other Scottish liberals. The following excerpt from William Henry Channing's *Memoir* is eloquent testimony to the effect Hutcheson had on William Ellery Channing and is all the more significant in view of what I have just said of his pietistic background. A youth full of pietistic enthusiasm would naturally react to Platonism in the manner here described.

The two authors who most served to guide his thoughts at this period [during his college days] were Hutcheson and Ferguson. It was while reading, one day, in the former, some of the various passages in which he asserts man's capacity for disinterested affection, and considers virtue as the sacrifice of private interests and the bearing of private evils for the public good, or as self-devotion to absolute, universal good, that there suddenly burst upon his mind that view of the dignity of human nature, which was ever after to "uphold" . . . him. . . . The place and the hour were always sacred in his memory. . . . It seemed to him, that he then passed through a new spiritual birth, and entered upon the day of eternal peace and joy. The glory of the Divine disinterestedness, the privilege of existing in a universe of progressive order and beauty, the possibilities of spiritual destiny, the sublimity of devotedness to the will of Infinite Love, penetrated his soul; and he was so borne away in rapturous visions, that, to quote his own words . . . "I longed to die, and felt as if heaven alone could give room for the exercise of such emotions; but when I found I must live, I cast about to do something worthy of these great

¹⁶ *Sermon on the Annual Fast in Massachusetts, April 5, 1798* (Boston, 1798), 13.

¹⁷ See his sermon "On Christian Zeal," in *Sermons on Important Subjects* (Boston, 1807), 15.

¹⁸ See his sermons "On the Love of Our Neighbor" and "On Christian Charity," pp. 55-87 in *Sermons on Important Subjects*.

INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF W. E. CHANNING 11

thoughts; and my enthusiasm at that age, being then but fifteen, turning strongly to the female sex. . . . I sat down and wrote to this lady,—laying his hand upon his wife's arm . . . "but I never got courage to send the letter."¹⁹

As Hutcheson revealed to Channing that holiness might be a natural capacity of man, so Ferguson²⁰ suggested to him that regeneration is a gradual and a social process. Imagine the effect of the following sentences on a young mind steeped in Edwardian theology:

Natural productions are generally formed by degrees. . . . [Animals] have a progress in what they perform, as well as in the faculties they acquire. This progress in the case of man is continued to a greater extent than in that of any other animal. Not only the individual advances from infancy to manhood, but the species itself from rudeness to civilization. Hence the supposed departure of mankind from the state of their nature; hence our conjectures and different opinions of what man must have been in the first age of his being. . . . If the question be put, What the mind of man could perform, when left to itself, and without the aid of any foreign direction? We are to look for our answer in the history of mankind. . . . We speak of art as distinguished from nature; but art itself is natural to man. He is in some measure the artificer of his own frame, as well as of his fortune, and is destined, from the first age of his being, to invent and contrive. . . . If we are asked therefore, where the state of nature is to be found? We may answer, it is here; . . . all situations are equally natural. . . . "Man is born in society," says Montesquieu, "and there he remains."²¹

Can you imagine the wrench this must have given the Puritan reader? In place of the Fall; the primitive animal. In place of regeneration, progress by degrees. In place of the divine plan of redemption in history, history is "the mind of man left to itself without the aid of any foreign direction." In place of the congregational covenant with God, or the Social Contract, man is naturally born into society and simply stays there. In short, we are here intellectually in the middle of the nineteenth century. And, if you recall that according to Ferguson the fundamental principle of progress was the principle of variation, and that human history is man's attempt to adapt himself

19 *Memoir*, I, 63-64.

20 Adam Ferguson was professor of Pneumatics and Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh from 1764 to 1785. He was inspired directly and chiefly by Montesquieu. His chief work, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, was published at Edinburgh in 1767; the seventh edition in Boston, 1809; the eighth in Philadelphia, 1819. This is an index of its extreme popularity in America. The following quotations are from the seventh edition.

21 Ferguson, *An Essay*, 1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 28.

continually to new natural situations, we are practically in the middle of Darwinism.

History is here conceived not as the history of individuals or of mankind as a whole, but as the history of peoples or nations. There are essentially three kinds of nations corresponding to three stages of history: (1) rude nations, which are based on the principles of rank and authority, which despise the "commercial arts," and which gradually succumb to "property and interest"; (2) polished and commercial nations; ("It is here [in a commercial state] indeed, if ever, that man is sometimes found a detached and a solitary being; he has found an object which sets him in competition with his fellow creatures, and he deals with them as he does with his cattle and his soil, for the sake of the profits they bring.")²² (3) corrupt nations, in which the wealth brought about by the differentiation of the arts and professions as they are found in the polished and commercial nations, has failed to develop the moral or public interests, and which are therefore overcome by the evils of luxury, slavery, and despotism.

Ferguson's psychology is no less interesting. There are three levels of human motivation. (1) Instinctive self-preservation. This is not self-love. There is no such thing as self-love. Self-preservation is a purely animal reaction. (2) Love, or interest. "Love is a complacency and a continued satisfaction *in an object.*" It induces a man to devote himself to some object; by love man sacrifices even his life to the object of his love or interest. The most developed, civilized form of love or interest is commerce, where each devotes himself to what he can best pursue and where exchange of the products benefits every one. (3) Moral sentiment. This is a third, ultimate motive in human conduct, and its highest form is a persistent interest in social good, in other words, republican virtue. This public or republican virtue is the highest form of morality as of love. It is practically equivalent to the love of God.

According to this analysis there is no automatic principle or guarantee of progress in nature. Corruption is as natural as progress. The welfare of man is therefore dependent on the continued use of his reason, and the fundamental problem of reason is the task of keeping the object of private love (com-

²² Ferguson, *An Essay*, 32.

merce) co-operating with the object of moral sentiment (the public good).²³ "National felicity" is the greatest interest of man, and benevolence, that is, public virtue, is not merely a duty but "the surest happiness." This glorification of republican nationalism needs no commentary. I merely call attention to the fact that though it is presented as a scientific history of civil society, it is really the classical tradition of political theory revived. Quite unconsciously for the most part, the American and French Revolutions were surrounded with a halo of classicism.

The conclusion to which I am coming in all this is that the reason it seemed plausible at this time to separate church and state was that each had its own philosophy; the political being pagan, the ecclesiastical Christian. This dualism in American thought, this parallelism of the Christian theodicy with the pagan, republican "church philosophic," as John Adams called it, has maintained itself to this day, though less clearly than at the time of the Revolution and the Enlightenment. It undermined completely the Puritan conception of a unitary church-society. It also brought out an inherent conflict in American morals: the conflict between personal piety and civic virtue, between man in his natural relations to being in general and man in his social relations to his fellow citizens.

More congenial to Channing than Ferguson's radical secularism was a combination of Hutcheson and Ferguson, which

²³ "If we would find the causes of final corruption, we must examine those revolutions of state that remove, or withhold, the objects of every ingenuous study or liberal pursuit; that deprive the citizen of occasions to act as a member of a public; that crush his spirit; that debase his sentiments, and disqualify his mind for affairs" (Ferguson, *An Essay*, 353).

In the perfect state "the productions of ingenuity are brought to the market; and men are willing to pay for whatever has a tendency to inform or amuse. By this means the idle, as well as the busy, contribute to forward the progress of arts, and bestow on polished nations that air of superior ingenuity, under which they appear to have gained the ends that were pursued by the savage in the forest, knowledge, order, and wealth" (300-301).

"It is wisely ordered for man, as a rational being, that the employment of reason is necessary to his preservation; . . . and it is fortunate for nations, that, in order to be powerful and safe, they must strive to maintain the courage, and cultivate the virtues, of their people" (101). "We may hope to instil into the breasts of private men sentiments of candour towards their fellow creatures, and a disposition to humanity and justice. But it is vain to expect that we can give to the multitude of a people a sense of union among themselves, without admitting hostility to those who oppose them. Could we at once, in the case of any nation, extinguish the emulation which is excited from abroad, we should probably break or weaken the bands of society at home, and close the busiest scenes of national occupations and virtues" (41).

"But to separate the arts which form the citizen and the statesman, the arts of policy and war, is an attempt to dismember the human character, and to destroy those very arts we mean to improve" (381).

he found in the *Dissertations* of Richard Price, the English liberal and dissenter, whose defense of American independence won him many friends in this country. "Price," he wrote, "saved me from Locke's philosophy. He gave me the Platonic doctrine of ideas, and like him I always write the words Right, Love, Idea, etc., with a capital letter. His book, probably, moulded my philosophy into the form it has always retained, and opened my mind into the *transcendental depth*. And I have always found in the accounts I have read of German philosophy in Madame de Staël, and in these later times, that it was cognate to my own. I cannot say that I have ever received a new idea from it; and the cause is obvious, if Price was alike the father of *it* and of *mine*."²⁴ He valued Price not only for his Platonism in general but especially for the application he gave to it. Price defended an idealistic version of Unitarianism against Locke and Priestley, and he used the doctrine that "almost every object in nature grows gradually, from a weak and low, to a mature and improved state of being" to argue that the "perfect revelation of Christianity was impossible at first" and must await "the gradual improvement in culture."²⁵ He interpreted Condorcet's philosophy of progress and the American and French Revolutions to prove the near approach of the millennium, when Christianity would be perfected and freed from all establishments and when the mind would be perfectly "adapted" to its objects.²⁶

Had Channing's philosophy of social progress proceeded no further he might have turned out a typical New England idealist, but circumstances pushed him immediately after his graduation into the heart of the Jeffersonian aristocracy in Richmond, Virginia. For almost two years, 1798-1800, two crucial years, he lived in a family of Randolphs as private tutor. Unfortunately I can not undertake to give a detailed narrative of his intellectual and religious crisis in Virginia. I select a few passages from his correspondence, which will suggest in general what was taking place in his mind. I must preface the first citation with the remark that he soon learned that the Vir-

²⁴ Peabody, *Reminiscences*, 368.

²⁵ *The Evidence For a Future Period of Improvement in the State of Mankind With the Means and Duty of Promoting It* (London, 1787), 11, 16.

²⁶ Cf. his Platonic theory of knowledge, based largely on Cudworth, in *Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals* (1769). Price's *Dissertations on Matter and Spirit* were translated into both French and German and were said to have made a great impression especially on German thought.

INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF W. E. CHANNING 15

ginians thought Yankee idealism little more than a screen for Yankee commercial interests, and he soon began to think of the Virginians as more disinterested patriots. With his characteristic enthusiasm he explains what he is learning to his college friends at home:

My political opinions have varied a little since I saw you; but it would be unfair to charge them to the Jacobin atmosphere of Virginia. I trust that I am guided by sober reflection. I view the world as a wide field of action, designed by its Framers to perfect the human character. Political institutions are valuable only as they improve and morally elevate human nature. Wealth and power are subordinate considerations, and are far from constituting the real greatness of a state. I blush for mankind, when I see *interest* the only tie which binds them to their country, when I see the social compact improved for no purpose but the accumulation of riches, and the prosperity of a nation decided by the successful avarice of its members. I wish to see *patriotism* exalted into a *moral principle*, not a branch of avarice.²⁷

Write soon; correct me, if I am wrong. You will find that my political principles and ideas of government are branches of my moral system. You do not know what an enthusiast I have grown for *liberty*.²⁸

It is now that I experience the benefit of habits which I formed in early life. O Heaven! what a wretch should I be, how wearisome would be existence, had I not learned to depend on myself for enjoyment! Society becomes more and more insipid. I am tired of the fashionable nonsense which dins my ear in every circle, and I am driven to my book and pen for relief and pleasure. With my book and pen in my hand, I am always happy. Nature or education has given this bent to my mind, and I esteem it as the richest blessing Heaven ever sent me. I am independent of the world. Above all things, cultivate this independence. You know it is my idol, and I know of no virtue more necessary to a politician.²⁹

I shall now read history very differently from what I used to do. I shall read it as a politician and a moralist. I shall find my opinions of government on what I see to be the effects of different systems, and not on idle speculation. I study harder than ever. I have just been reading Priestley's Lectures, and have derived considerable advantage from them. I admire, above all, Ferguson's Civil Society. You lost a treasure, Shaw, when you sold it to me.³⁰

I have lately read Mrs. Wolstonecraft's posthumous works. Her letters, toward the end of the first volume, are the best I ever read. They are superior to Sterne's. I consider that woman as the greatest of the age. Her "Rights of Woman" is a masculine performance, and ought to be studied by the sex. *Can* you call her a prostitute? She indeed formed a guilty connection. But even then she acted upon principle.³¹

27 *Memoir*, I, 86-87.

28 I, 89.

29 I, 98-99.

30 I, 100.

31 I, 101-102.

I have been reading Rousseau's *Eloise*. What a writer! Rousseau is the only French author I have ever read, who knows the way to the heart.

I would also recommend to you a novel, *Caleb Williams*, by Godwin. Shaw, what a melancholy reflection is it that the writers I have now mentioned were all deists!³²

I sit down to write you, to disburden a full heart, and cheer a heavy hour. It is spring-time, and a universal langour has seized on me. Not long ago, I was an eagle. I had built my nest among the stars, and I soared in regions of unclouded ether. But I fell from heaven, and the spirit which once animated me has fled. I have lost every energy of soul, and the only relic of your friend is a sickly imagination, a fevered sensibility. I cannot study. I walk and muse till I can walk no longer. I sit down with Goldsmith or Rogers in my hand, and shed tears—at what? At fictitious misery; at tales of imaginary woe.

My whole life has been a struggle with my feelings. Last winter I thought myself victorious. But earth-born Antaeus has risen stronger than ever. I repeat it, my whole life has been a struggle with my feelings.³³

"It is true," said I, "that I sit in my study and shed tears over human misery. I weep over a novel. I weep over a tale of human woe. But do I ever relieve the distressed? Have I ever lightened the load of affliction?" My cheeks reddened at the question; a cloud of error burst from my mind. I found that virtue did not consist in feeling, but in *acting from a sense of duty*.³⁴

I have of late, my friend, launched boldly into speculations on the possible condition of mankind in the progress of their improvement. I find *avarice* the great bar to all my schemes, and I do not hesitate to assert that the human race will never be happier than at present till the establishment of a community of property.³⁵

I am convinced that virtue and benevolence are *natural* to man. I believe that selfishness and avarice have arisen from two ideas universally inculcated on the young and practised upon by the old,—(1.) that *every individual has a distinct interest to pursue from the interest of the community*; and (2.) that *the body requires more care than the mind*.

I believe these ideas to be false; and I believe that you can never banish them, till you persuade mankind to cease to act upon them; that is, till you can persuade them (1.) to destroy all distinctions of property (which you are sensible must perpetuate this supposed distinction of interest), and to throw the produce of their labor into one common stock, instead of hoarding it up in their own garners; and (2.) to become really conscious of the powers and the dignity of the mind. You must convince mankind that they themselves, and all which they possess, are but *parts of a great whole*; that they are bound by God, their common Father,

³² I, 102.

³³ I, 106.

³⁴ I, 107-108.

³⁵ I, 111.

INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF W. E. CHANNING 17

to *labor* for the good of this great whole; that their wants are but few, and can easily be supplied; that *mind, mind* requires all their care; and the dignity of their nature and the happiness of others require them to improve this mind in science and virtue. Believe me, my friend, you can never root out selfishness and avarice, till you destroy the idea that private interest is distinct from the public. You must lead every man to propose to himself, in all his actions, the good of the whole for his object. He must plough and till the earth, that all may eat of the produce of his labor. *Mine* and *thine* must be discarded from his vocabulary. He should call everything *ours*.³⁶

You profess to believe in the Christian religion. Does not Christianity favor such a scheme? I believe it will be hard to reconcile Christian humility, charity, and contempt of riches with the present establishment of human affairs. . . . Rouse, then! Consider how you may best serve mankind.³⁷

I believe that I never experienced that *change of heart* which is necessary to constitute a Christian, till within a few months past. The worldling would laugh at me; he would call conversion a farce. But the man who has felt the influences of the Holy Spirit can oppose fact and experience to empty declaration and contemptuous sneers. . . .

All my sentiments and affections have lately changed. I once considered mere moral attainments as the only object I had to pursue. I have now solemnly given myself up to God. I consider supreme love to him as the first of all duties, and morality seems but a branch from the vigorous root of religion. I love mankind because they are the children of God.³⁸

Channing was apparently on the verge of "joining himself as minister to a settlement of Scotch emigrants, whose fundamental principle was common property,"³⁹ when his relatives called him back to New England. Intellectually, too, the young communist returned home. He had been converted by his political enthusiasm to a religious faith, and his fanatic mortification of the flesh made of him a physical wreck and gave him that "spiritual" pallor of countenance for which he became famous. Henceforth he was neither a secular republican, devoting himself out of a patriotic sense of duty to the public good, nor a pietist, looking down upon mere secular morality. He saw piety and duty reconciled in the religion of humanity.

I need not outline Channing's humanitarian philosophy, since it is probably familiar; my aim has been to trace its sources. I call attention merely to his great project, a philosophic treatise,

36 I, 113-114.

37 I, 115.

38 I, 126-127.

39 I, 116.

which he never wrote. Its title is significant, "The Principles of Moral, Religious, and Political Science." The aim was to show the union of morality, religion, and politics—that is, the inter-relatedness of piety, virtue, and republican patriotism. In the Preface intended for this work he wrote as follows:

The true perfection of man is the great idea of the moral sciences. His nature is therefore to be examined so as to determine its central law, and the end for which all religious and political institutions should be established. . . . Just views of human nature are, then, all-important. In comprehending man, . . . we have the key to the Divine administration of the world.⁴⁰

Throughout the Enlightenment this emphasis on human nature was a familiar theme; but note the significant shift in aim. Locke's aim was to find the origin of human understanding in order to reveal its natural limitations; Channing's aim was to find the perfection of human nature in order to realize its possibilities. This is the essential difference between empiricism and humanitarianism.

Pursuing this aim, Channing made significant modifications in the concepts he had inherited from the Enlightenment. The idea of "disinterested benevolence" he transformed into the idea of "diffusive charity." The characteristic of true benevolence is not for him, as for Edwards, that it has a distinct object, general being, but merely its social diffusion. This social and humanitarian concept of love, combined the holy love of pietism, the disinterestedness of the moralists, and the public virtue of the republicans.⁴¹ Thus God's justice is really only a form of his mercy. He assists man to become perfect gradually. This regeneration of man or moral progress also implies "social regeneration," which also must be gradual and is thus identical with reform or progress. However, the fact that Channing continued to use the terminology of regeneration is not a merely verbal matter; it is a tribute to his abiding pietism.

⁴⁰ *Memoir*, II, 403-404.

⁴¹ He wrote: "I fear it has been the influence of many speculations of ingenious men on the Divine character to divest God of that paternal tenderness which is of all views most suited to touch the heart. I fear we have learnt insensibly to view him as possessing only a *general* benevolence" (*Memoir*, I, 253). "I felt, I saw, that God is most willing to impart his 'Holy Spirit,' his strength and light, to every man who labors in earnest to overcome evil, to press forward to that perfection which is the only heaven" (*Memoir*, I, 345).

Only it is now a socialized pietism.⁴² Channing turned from the churches as particular "societies" to society in general as a channel of regenerating grace. The "perpetual regeneration" of its members is the duty of society as such. At times Channing talked much like a Jeffersonian republican, in terms of political reform, but on the whole he seems disillusioned on that score. The moral elevation can not come through politics. He was especially outspoken on this point after his return from Europe in 1823. He wrote, for example:

I return with views of society which make me rejoice as I never did before in the promise held out by revealed religion of a *moral renovation* of the world. I expect less and less from revolutions, political changes, violent struggles,—from public men or measures,—in a word, from any outward modification of society. Corrupt institutions will be succeeded by others equally, if not more, corrupt, whilst the root principle lives in the heart of individuals and nations; and the only remedy is to be found in a moral change, to which Christianity and the Divine power that accompanies it, are alone adequate.⁴³

Later in life he was even more sceptical of the benefits of mere civil liberty and emphasized continually that liberty is a personal "moral" problem.⁴⁴

We all see that civil liberty has not produced that sudden melioration and exaltation of human nature which was confidently hoped; nor has religious liberty borne all the fruits we hoped. Still, a good work is going on. Slavery and bigotry and worldliness will not reign forever.⁴⁵

Slavery, bigotry, and worldliness are the three enemies

42 "It seems to me that the signs of the times point to a *great approaching modification of society*, which will be founded on and will express the essential truth, that the chief end of the social state is the elevation of all its members as intelligent and moral beings, and under which every man will be expected to contribute to this object according to his ability. The present selfish, dissocial system must give way to Christianity, and I earnestly wish that we may bear our full part in effecting this best of all revolutions" (*Memoir*, III, 38).

43 *Memoir*, II, 249.

44 As late as 1820 we find him still glorifying civil liberty. "I am almost tempted to say that this is the only political blessing, and the only good gift which law and order can confer on a country" (*Memoir*, II, 81). In 1822, on the other hand, he writes: "Does a government advance liberty simply by establishing equal laws? The very protection of property may crush a large mass of the community. ... Is it not the true end of government, to aim at securing for all the widest field of useful action? This is to establish liberty. How far more important is this than to protect any single class!" (II, 226-227). And from this economic conception of liberty it was only a short step in his mind to the moral conception of "self-culture" and the "elevation of the laboring classes" by "moral" means. By 1828 he is writing: "Can legislation do much towards reforming men? Has not the power of government in this as in every thing, been overrated? Can associations do much? Is it not by individual interest, by unaffected individual friendship, by teaching from the lips of philanthropy . . ." etc. (III, 26).

45 *Memoir*, III, 308.

respectively of republicanism, rationalism, and pietism; and it was to the struggle against these enemies that Channing's humanitarianism was whole-heartedly devoted. His idea of moral society, of diffusive benevolence, was an attempt to mediate between the Calvinistic theory of church-societies as the channels of redemptive grace and the republican theory of free political institutions as the guardians of public virtue. The Enlightenment had tried to reconcile these two ideas, the Christian and the pagan, in terms of disinterested benevolence. Now, disinterested benevolence is, strictly speaking, a psychological impossibility, a contradiction in terms. It is merely a phrase in which disinterestedness, or justice, and benevolence, or love, are juxtaposed. What the phrase really intended to say was the love of justice, benevolence toward disinterestedness. Calvinism and Platonism had this emphasis in common. So also did the idea of republican virtue. Channing and humanitarianism inverted this concept. They revolted against the cult of justice. God is not essentially a sovereign, a law-giver, as he had been conceived most strictly by the Hopkinsians; he is a father. Even God loves man as man. The political relation must be subordinated to the natural kinship of spirits. Benevolence, not disinterestedness, is the ultimate good. But love of what? Love by nature must have an object. And the difference between sacred and profane love, as both Plato and Edwards had taught, was a difference in the object of love. Channing evaded this issue. He translated the idea of love into "doing good," or charity, according to which instead of loving some object the lover does others a service. This destroys Platonism, whose approach is esthetic, the love of perfection, and creates a religion of duty. Channing welcomed this transformation of love, though he failed to appreciate the difference it made. To him virtue, doing one's daily duty, not spectacular benevolence but ordinary morality, was supremely beautiful. "Wherever a duty can be performed, there is the temple and the acceptable sacrifice."⁴⁶ This glorification of morality and human nature thus turned out to be the culmination of Channing's thought, as it was also of the Enlightenment in general. The transition from the Enlightenment to Transcendentalism is so smooth that

46 Peabody, *Reminiscences*, 196. That Channing identified benevolence with duty in practice as well as in theory is reflected in the advice he gave to friends from time to time. Almost invariably he cautioned them against assuming extraordinary obligations or romantic responsibilities. Cf. Peabody, *op. cit.*, 317.

it is difficult to detect. Its essence, however, is precisely this: the shift from the love of justice to the love of love, and from the love of love to the love of human nature. In other words, from faith in universal moral order, as exhibited in both the Calvinistic and the republican versions of Platonism, he shifted to faith in social benevolence or humanitarianism, and from this he shifted to the faith of romantic Transcendentalism in individual freedom. Channing began virtually a pietist, with a socialized version of the theology of regeneration; he ended virtually a humanitarian, with a firm faith in human nature.

In closing let me point out but one further illustration of Channing's faithfulness to his early pietism. When Theodore Parker⁴⁷ about 1840, that is, shortly before Channing's death, published his reviews of the German historical scepticism and higher criticism, Channing wrote to Miss Peabody, "Our friend Parker makes truth unnecessarily repulsive."⁴⁸ And when he saw that not only Christ's miracles were being denied but that one after another of his Transcendentalist friends were hesitating to call themselves Christians, believing Christianity to be too exclusive to serve as a faith for all mankind, he wrote as follows:

The sacrifices that these young men have to make are not, as of old, flesh and blood, but the affections of the heart. They must see distrust and fear enter the hearts which they would love to keep in peace. They need the God-speed of minds great enough to cast out fear and to trust the Spirit, even when it manifests itself as a consuming fire.⁴⁹

I see not how the rejection of these can be separated from the rejection of Jesus Christ. Without them he becomes a mere fable. . . . Without miracles the historical Christ is gone. No such being is left us; and in losing him, how much is lost! Reduce Christianity to a set of abstract ideas, sever it from its teacher, and it ceases to be "the power of God unto salvation." Allow that it could give us the idea of perfection, which I cannot concede; yet what I want is, not the naked idea, but

⁴⁷ Parker's sermon, *Of Piety and the Relation Thereof to Manly Life*, should be read in this connection. Superficially its doctrine appears to be identical with Channing's conception of piety, but by carrying Channing's own principles to their logical conclusion, he strikes Channing at a very tender point. The man whose piety is perfectly "natural," argues Parker, "does not sigh and weep" and forever make "a fuss about his soul; he lives right on." For Parker piety culminates in external morality; for Channing the inner life of feeling, the fuss about the soul, is essential. Here, I suspect, is another outercropping of a deep difference between "naturalistic Christians" and "Mediatorialists." There is a real difference between Parker's "manliness" and Channing's humanitarianism.

⁴⁸ Peabody, *Reminiscences*, 420.

49 *Ibid.*, 417.

the existence, the realization of perfection. Some seem to think that the *idea* of infinite perfection answers all the purposes of a God. But, no: *the existence* of this perfection is the ground of my hope, my happiness; and so I want *the existence* of human perfection. . . .

The grand miracle, as it often has been said, is the perfect, divine character of Christ; and to such a being a miraculous mode of manifestation seems natural. It is by no figure of speech that I call Christ miraculous. He was more separate from other men than his *acts* from other acts. He was the *sinless* and *spotless* son of God, distinguished from all men by that *infinite peculiarity*,—freedom from *moral evil*. He was the perfect image of God, the perfection of the spiritual nature. . . .

I get no light from the “new views.” I seem to learn very little. Their vague generalities do not satisfy me. They seem wholly to overlook the actual moral condition of the human race on which Christianity is founded, and which renders it important to the multitude of men that they should have some evidence additional to that which is purely spiritual. Thousands and millions who desire to believe in immortality would be exposed to all the misgivings on that point which beset the best and strongest heathen minds, were it not for the resurrection and promises of Jesus Christ. . . .

Eustis preached a touching sermon yesterday upon the “loneliness” of Jesus Christ. I claim little resemblance to my divine friend and saviour; but I seem doomed to drink of this cup with him to the last. I see and feel the harm done by this crude speculation, while I also see much nobleness to bind me to its advocates. In its opinions generally I see nothing to give me hope. . . .

The profound ignorance of Jesus Christ shown by those who find in him a *restraint*, and who talk of *outgrowing* him, is discouraging. I find in him only freedom. I have little hope in this new movement save as it indicates the deep wants of the soul and a consciousness of its greatness.⁵⁰

This is an unequivocal statement of Channing’s belief in the value of the peculiar and distinctive traits of the Christian gospel. Much of his preaching, on the contrary, had been against the idea that there are peculiarities in Christianity; he had taken pains to prove that the content of Christianity and of natural religion were identical.⁵¹

His early writings were full of denunciation of the Calvinists for insisting on their distinctive doctrines of Christian salvation. He was finally forced into an analogous position. He would not deny the “moral miracle” of Christ in order to make his humanitarianism “catholic” for all mankind. Or, to use the words of William Henry Channing’s *Memoir*: “Of the three

⁵⁰ Peabody, *op. cit.* 423, 424, 430, 432.

⁵¹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 203.

INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF W. E. CHANNING 23

grand classes into which Christians may be grouped, the Trinitarians, the Naturalists, and the Mediatorialists, Mr. Channing undoubtedly belonged at this period [his youth] to the last."⁵² This judgment reflects the author's Transcendentalist tendency, but it represents William Ellery Channing accurately and is as true of William Ellery Channing's last days as of his youth. He remained distinctively a Christian and apparently felt that in doing so he was little less than a martyr.

52 *Memoir*, II, 92. Though Miss Peabody's interpretation of Channing's relation to Transcendentalism is biased and exaggerates Channing's "Mediatorialism," the quotations here given are from Channing's letters to her, not from her notes and memories. Reference to his late sermons and other writings would confirm the above account and testify to his emphasis on the person and resurrection of Christ.

SOME ESSAYS ON TOLERATION IN LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

CHARLES F. MULLETT

University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

I

The theory of toleration, often the child of indifference or of sectarian interest, is most difficult to analyse, whatever the issues. It may derive from indifference to the "rights" of conscience, while hiding behind an interested manner. The advocate frequently tolerates religious differences and hysterically cries "Crusade" against an economic heresy; or he shows charity toward one sect and simultaneously invokes the wrath of God and the power of Parliament against another which he considers in error. Often the plea proceeds from a minority whose very existence depends on toleration, but which on becoming a majority, demands conformity from others. Moreover, some men who have evoked a positive philosophy of toleration express only an *intellectual* interest. Yet whatever the basis—sectarian interest, intellectual sympathy, indifference, or a passionate love of freedom—toleration has always aroused sympathy and devotion.

The struggles for religious toleration in England show that this idea, like others, cannot be treated *in vacuo*. No writer on liberty of conscience, to be sure, failed to emphasize his belief in abstract toleration, yet often the ideal was conceived in self-interest, born in faction, and grew up amid indifference. The most exalted phrases, the most disinterested pleas came not from affected parties but from men emotionally anemic. Such sentiments smelled of the lamp, not of the battlefield. The cloistered author of treatises was not necessarily more idealistic than one who hewed out controversial pamphlets; his judgment indeed might be emasculated. Those who *said* most about toleration seldom had to practice it. More often than not, toleration was the word men gave to their indifference.

The eighteenth century displayed, however, no slight in-

terest in the question. Arguments for toleration filled contemporary pamphlets, and occasionally passed beyond the plea of a faction to consideration of a principle. The key to this interest lay in the close connection between toleration and political and legal status. When men were outlawed for nonconformity, toleration had practical connotations. Yet the demands were not limited to one sect; Anglican, Presbyterian, Independent, and Socinian, alike debated this issue, which largely revolved about the repeal of the Clarendon Code and, surprisingly, the Toleration Act.¹ Some Anglicans contended that such statutes at once affronted dissenters and stultified the church's spirituality, saying that a church in need of legislative defense could well be accused of sterility. Dissenters denounced the acts as tyrannical and also argued comprehensively for toleration. Particularly in the 1770's were they active, when in and out of Parliament they made concerted efforts to secure relief.

While the plea for toleration recurred in contemporary pamphlets, only the more formal and elaborated vindications will be treated here. Although many authors simulated objectivity, they did not extensively analyse abstract toleration; they stressed toleration of themselves and of their own ideas. Consequently, pragmatic assumptions and particular applications took precedence over exposition of the concept *per se*. These men had no doubts about the good which they sought; faced with a specific query, they would perhaps have admitted the desirability of complete toleration. At the same time they preferred to leave that issue aside. The concession of toleration to themselves was enough; let the principle wait on the particular victory.

Inasmuch as later writers on toleration found their inspiration in Locke, a few lines may well be devoted to summarizing his contribution. In his first *Letter concerning Toleration* he pronounced "the toleration of those that differ from others in

¹ The Clarendon Code included legislation which restricted the political, educational, and religious activity of dissenters, and by extension their social and economic life. The presence of the Toleration Act among the statutes objected to may well surprise those unfamiliar with its terms. Defenders of the Church of England maintained that the Toleration Act conceded everything a reasonable man could desire. Actually, while permitting freedom of worship, the act circumscribed dissenters through the requirement of oaths and declarations quite of a piece with the oppressive penal acts. Even freedom of worship was not wholly conceded, and the act by no means opened the door to full citizenship. Thus because it was a concession, it was also an obstacle.

matters of religion" to be so agreeable to the gospel of Christ and to the reason of mankind that it seemed monstrous for men not to perceive clearly the necessity and advantage of it. To end controversy a line should be drawn to distinguish the business of civil government from that of religion, and to settle the prerogative of each. The commonwealth being organized to secure the civil interests of the subjects, the civil magistrate should guarantee these interests by the impartial execution of the laws. But the jurisdiction of the magistrate stopped with civil concerns and did not extend to the salvation of souls.

Several reasons, according to Locke, sustained this limitation. First, God never gave any civil magistrate authority in this matter, and no magistrate could acquire such power by the consent of the people. Prescription of faith lay outside the power of man. Secondly, the care of souls could not belong to the civil magistrate because, while true religion consisted only in the persuasion of the mind, the magistrate's power consisted in force. Thirdly, the care of souls could not belong to the magistrate because even though he might force the people's minds he could not save their souls. As a voluntary society, living under laws which it had made for its own convenience, no religious body had any license to regard itself as the only true church, and no one church could dictate to any other religious society. Lastly, men could freely join that society which best satisfied their soul's demands. The end of a religious society was the public worship of God; nothing ought to obstruct that purpose. The civil magistrate as such had no place in a religious society where the only rules were legislated by the members. Members proving intractable might be thrust out; no other punishment could be inflicted.

When these sentiments were repeated a century later they had a more concrete significance in that their authors were members of persecuted religious societies, not philosophers with an interest largely intellectual. Moreover, eighteenth century authors had not only to batter down the old walls but also to overcome some new barricades. Of the latter perhaps the most formidable was Blackstone, whose *Commentaries* provided unimpeachable authority for regarding nonconformity as a crime.²

² *Commentaries* (Lewis ed.), IV, 41-65. For further evidence along this line see the present writer's "The Legal Position of English Protestant Dissenters, 1689-1767," 23 *Virginia Law Review* (1937), 389-418.

No wonder that several advocates of toleration directed their thrusts against this influential expositor of the laws of England! What made Blackstone so dangerous was not only the authority of his utterances, but his avowed sympathy for toleration, while urbanely condemning the dissenters to outlawry.

In considering these dissertations attention will first be given to those which dealt with toleration rather obliquely, and secondly with the full length essays. Of course most tracts written at this time either for or against the dissenting claims belong to the first category but space will be allowed only to those which primarily sought toleration and secondarily treated other religious problems. To distinguish between them is not easy, for some tracts put forward as abstract discussions might well stand with those to which toleration was but one of several aims.

II

Among those who sought to improve the dissenters' juridical status none surpassed in eminence the versatile Joseph Priestley, who in replying to Blackstone's insinuation that "*the spirit, the principles, and the practices of the sectaries are not calculated to make men good subjects*" expounded a theory of toleration.³ Most people, he explained, were surprised to discover dissenters (he excluded Quakers from his discussion) neither all canting hypocrites nor revolutionaries. Dissenters like Christians generally were not a uniform set of men; although he himself felt that the doctrine of the Trinity denied to God the honor due Him alone, he was sure that the favor of God extended to all. Notwithstanding their lack of uniformity, dissenters had several ideas in common.

All dissenters disclaimed human authority in religion and stood fast in the gospel. They deplored the establishment's hierarchy and the investment of ecclesiastical officers with civil power, as unfitting leaders to exemplify humility and as encouraging men to subscribe what they did not believe in order to advance. Dissenters objected to vestments and to the liturgy because these features had no basis in reason or the Scriptures.

³ *A View of the Principles and Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters with respect to the civil and ecclesiastical Constitution of England* (2 ed. n. d.). This was written in 1769.

Finally, many dissenters rejected the doctrines of the Trinity, original sin, predestination, and the damnation of the heathen. However, many churchmen rejected the Thirty-nine Articles, and many laymen in the establishment considered its doctrines hostile to truth. By their prevarication the clergy caused infidelity; and the errors of the church in such matters as the Trinity prevented the spread of Christianity. By contrast, dissenters, excepting the Scottish Presbyterians who were as full of error as the Anglicans, encouraged free inquiry. Although dissenters opposed many features of the establishment, they did not oppose establishments *per se*: they only desired one sufficiently comprehensive to tolerate perfect freedom. While admittedly unimportant, many requirements made of dissenters touched a fundamental principle, considering how ceremonies might pile up and dissenters be required to practice them.

Contrary to widespread belief, he continued, dissenters, while rendering unto God the things that were God's, happily rendered unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's. Objection to the ecclesiastical hierarchy implied no hostility to the civil order; neither did disbelief in the Trinity make dissenters bad citizens. Dissenters did not love the prerogative, having suffered much from it, but they supported limited monarchy. In contemporary politics they divided like the rest of the nation. Many feared to oppose the court lest they give umbrage, but others sought the welfare of the country. Dissenters, seldom people of wealth, sympathized with the lower classes, yet they were not egalitarians and republicans. In conclusion, Priestley praised dissent as producing greater freedom of inquiry and opportunity for toleration. He foresaw, however, that toleration might have one unfortunate effect: dissenters, fully tolerated, might lose their zeal and incline to the establishment.

Another essay dealing rather obliquely with toleration came from the pen of Dr. Samuel Stennett who pleaded for toleration in terms of dissenting efforts for relief.⁴ Because toleration promoted truth and religion, he opposed the Corporation, Test, and Toleration Acts "as contrary to every maxim of sound policy" and to the "spirit of the Christian Religion." They

⁴ *A Free and Dispassionate Account of the late Application of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers to Parliament. In a Letter to a Friend* (1772). Stennett (1728-95) was a prominent and influential dissenting minister and a member of a family long outstanding in religious affairs.

disabled dissenters from acting as tutors and schoolmasters, but the ministers who under the Toleration Act subscribed the doctrinal articles of the Church of England escaped legal penalties. With Priestley he emphasized the varieties of dissenters. Many opposed several doctrines in the articles, others believed in the main but not in every particular, and others merely opposed subscription as invading the right of conscience. Were all these people criminal? Although seldom executed, the very existence of the laws contravened justice, reason, liberty, and humanity. So far, the temporal courts had stopped the proceedings of the spiritual courts against tutors and schoolmasters; perhaps the state would some day prosecute, then no relief would be forthcoming. Hence, the penal laws should be repealed. To make the situation worse, when dissenters sought release from subscription, their opponents held it absurd to excuse those who could subscribe, sinful to betray indifference to the articles, and dangerous to encourage error.

In reply Stennett denied the absurdity of seeking freedom from the terror of penalties, even though a man could subscribe. Removal of subscription expressed no indifference; the articles would be dignified by not making them persecution principles, and any zealous person could still freely subscribe. The opinion that the removal of subscription would encourage false doctrines did not flatter the church's religious principles. Christ did not advance his teachings by the sword, and appeals to force made men suspect the truth of doctrines thus defended. Laws would not restrain an opinion however erroneous since persecution did not smother but propagated doctrines. Because subscription to the Scriptures was a divine test, no magistrate had a right to impose it.

Here Stennett turned to contemporary events for a text. During the Commons' debate on a petition from some established clergy for release from subscription to the articles, Lord North in opposing the petition admitted reason for a dissenters' petition to the same purpose. Encouraged, the dissenters through their central committee applied for removal of subscription. The shortness of time did not permit getting the approval of all dissenters, and after the bill embodying the application had passed the Commons and was defeated in the Lords despite strong sup-

port, widespread criticism arose among Calvinistic dissenters.⁵ According to Stennett, the critics laid themselves open to charges of intolerance, but if they sincerely feared for doctrinal principles, let no imputation be cast upon their tolerance. The primary question, however, concerned not doctrine but liberty; even if the enemies of subscription opposed the doctrines of the articles, the merits of the case would be the same. Moreover, the dissenters' cause suffered when disagreement arose over the question of liberty. The dissentients from the application should have concurred with it; if the articles ever acquired an Arminian cast the Calvinistic opponents of the application would be liable to the very penalties whose removal they had resisted. Suppose these men excused from the charge of intolerance, they were still guilty of deficient understandings in opposing the mode of the application. If their opposition derived from zeal for Christian doctrines they expressed that zeal in a misguided fashion.

At this point we may well consider the toleration arguments of a man who objected to the view that the penalties liable under the Toleration Act had been frequently if not constantly imposed, for he insisted that not one dissenting minister of the day had been molested.⁶ The author recalled that dissenters professed to differ from the established church not in any fundamentals, but about the distance from the corrupt Roman church and about church government, forms of worship, and indifferent ceremonies. Dissenters had toleration in fact and their disobedience to the law was connived at. Why seek more? They were more likely to suffer from fellow dissenters than from the state or the church. To expect the government to tolerate hostility to the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, was injudicious. Dissenters themselves admitted that the safety of

⁵ The dissenting opponents to the applications for relief defended their stand on the ground that they were orthodox believers while the supporters of relief were rationalists. See *Candid Thoughts on the late Application of some Protestant Dissenting Ministers to Parliament, for abolishing the Subscription required of them by the Toleration Act. By an Orthodox Dissenter* (1772), and Edward Hitchin, *Free Thoughts on the late Application of some Dissenting Ministers to Parliament; in a Letter to the Rev. XXXXXX wherein is proved, that the prayer of their petition originated with sentiment: to which are added remarks on the new test; with a few strictures on the different pieces published in defence of the said application* (1772).

⁶ *A Letter to the Protestant Dissenting Ministers who lately solicited Parliament for further relief* (1773). I have not been able to trace the authorship of this tract, although it has been attributed to a John Butler. Whether this was John Butler, Bishop of Hereford (1717-1802), is not clear. Butler was a constant pamphleteer.

the state constituted the proper limit of toleration. They claimed toleration as a right, yet they already had complete freedom of opinion; no government could grant more. The state might control preachers as it controlled lawyers and doctors. Despite doctrines contrary to Christianity, dissenters were secure; more than that, no disinterested person could expect. To argue that principles tending to immorality were not cognizable by the magistrate, meant that only the practitioner, not the preacher, of sedition ought to be punished.

Here the author considered whether the dissenters were so tolerant as they suggested. In no instance had they shown any partiality for the establishment, a striking contrast to the bishops in 1689, who would have required of dissenters only general approbation of the articles. While some churchmen had persecuted dissenters, personal malice, not religious zeal, had motivated them. Dissenters assumed the appearance of distress when undistressed and desired more than sound policy justified. They sought that which implied a denial of the doctrines of the Church of England, a moderate, compromising church, desirous of peace. In conclusion the author applauded a comprehensive establishment and deplored strife and arrogance. Churchmen and dissenters ought to unite against infidels and papists instead of dividing over unimportant details. Discord within English Protestant ranks could only damage state and religion alike.

The final essay of the 1770's, considered here, which touched toleration rather indirectly, came from Philip Furneaux, who worked with pen, tongue, and political pressure to improve the position of his fellow dissenters. In 1771 he addressed several letters to Blackstone concerning the latter's exposition of the Toleration Act and religious liberty.⁷ A second edition followed immediately and included the arguments of Justice Foster and Lord Mansfield who first declared nonconformity no crime.⁸

⁷ *Letters to the honourable Mr. Justice Blackstone, concerning his exposition of the Act of Toleration, and some positions relative to religious liberty, in his celebrated Commentaries on the Laws of England* (2 ed., 1771). Furneaux (1726-83) was an Independent minister and occupied several famous pulpits during his career. He enjoyed considerable reputation as a preacher. In addition, he had a good deal of weight in nonconformist educational affairs.

⁸ The arguments of Foster and Mansfield were stated in the case of *Harrison v. Evans* which concerned the fining of men for their incapacity to serve a corporation office, double punishment for one offense in that the Corporation Act (1661) prevented dissenters from holding the office and a corporation by-law

Because Blackstone treated nonconformity, along with other offenses against religion and morals, as criminal, Furneaux admonished him point by point, begging him to reconsider those passages which injured religious liberty, and to promote just conceptions of private judgment and liberty of conscience.

Furneaux premised that persecution was to be most expected in behalf of a bad cause; he understood "Romish" persecution but not Protestant imitation. Agreeing with Locke that the Toleration Act, though deficient, was beneficial, he nevertheless observed that few people appreciated the exact state of legal toleration. Deists and Arians, if they declared their sentiments, could not hold offices of trust, act as guardians, bring any action into court, or speak against the Book of Common Prayer. Far from giving security the Toleration Act seriously penalized many and denied privileges to those whom it comprehended. To receive freedom only by connivance caused uneasiness. No laws inconsistent with the rights of conscience should continue, for to justify a statute as a deterrent but not as a weapon was a suspicious doctrine. Contrary to Blackstone, Furneaux denied that after the Toleration Act, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents were criminals and that exemption from penalties did not mean exemption from the crime. If the statute law no longer made dissent criminal, neither did the common law, for that law developed before dissent was born. The Toleration Act not only exempted dissenters' worship from punishment, it established that worship; likewise it modified the dissenters' position in other ways. Before its passage a court had denied a legacy to dissenting ministers; afterwards the judgment was reversed. One might question the extent of the act but not the benefits to those whom it embraced.

Here Furneaux asked the proper authority for punishing heresy. Ecclesiastical or legislative agencies were incapable of defining the boundaries of true faith. Let the Bible provide the test. Every man believed according to his own light, on human testimony rather than on human authority; belief on testimony rested on fact whereas belief on authority rested on opinion and often contravened reason. While one man's under-

punished them for not holding it. This case had stretched over the period, 1752-67, and had aroused widespread interest because of the importance of the issue, the amount of money involved, and the number of courts to which the case was taken. The decision ended the practice of double punishment in this connection.

standing might surpass another's, it was given him by God to distinguish truth from error. If he erred it was not a crime, for God rather than man should be obeyed. Inasmuch as English law insufficiently defined heresy, penalties would not be rigorous. The establishment's power to exterminate heresy, however, neglected the presence of religion in the heart where no penalty could convince the understanding. Had religion been left to make its own way instead of being civilly established, it would have prospered more. National establishments, protected by penalties, violated the laws of Christ and absurdly made all religions but the one set up in a given state, false. Absolute state control of beliefs ended religious toleration everywhere; if human authority could penalize, it could destroy.

To believe that Christianity owed its preservation to the sword dishonored it. Human laws should touch no beliefs, only overt acts; many opinions threatened society but they could not be restrained by penal laws. Toleration should extend to Deists if their beliefs produced no treason. Admitting a distinction between positive opposition to Christianity and mere disbelief, God alone should punish calumny. While transgressions of divine law offended good men, the magistrate's penalties only indicated that Christianity could not stand alone. Compassion to revilers might drive home the truth of Christianity, and reason only should be directed against the critics. Toleration was a natural right, and to say that the penal laws preserved the national church was no compliment. Wherein consisted the crime in reviling the common prayer? Indecency, yes, but no crime! To set private against public judgment was no crime.

Furneaux then criticized Blacksone's opinion that altering the constitution of the church would violate the union between England and Scotland. The two were separate bodies in their ecclesiastical aspects; no act of union could prevent the concession of toleration. Neither church nor parliament could control matters of faith. That exclusion of dissenters from civil offices was essential to a national establishment was most extraordinary. Did not the church exist before the Test Act? Did not Scotland have a national establishment? Exclusion persecuted loyal subjects, and could only be justified as a public good. No evidence of public good appeared from the Test Act; indeed the contrary would seem true. Exclusion benefited the church only by protecting churchmen in emoluments and offices. Furneaux con-

cluded by insisting that dissenters were firm friends of the civil constitution as well as of liberty. They in no sense sought the destruction of the church, which they could not possibly achieve. Their principles would not destroy society, although such a charge might apply to papists and to a few extreme dissenters. True religion, however, involved only conscience.

III

In 1773 Furneaux published a more abstract piece.⁹ Dedicated to Mansfield, whose eloquent and learned attack on penal laws had aroused the enthusiasm of the dissenters, the tract was occasioned not merely by desire for toleration in the abstract, but also by the contemporary effort to remove some of the burdens on dissenting ministers. In his preface Furneaux referred especially to the penalty imposed by the Conventicle Act of 1664 on dissenting ministers who had not subscribed the articles. Both the penalty and the method of conviction shocked him. The oath of two witnesses before a justice of the peace sufficed to convict, and the penalty was to be levied upon the goods of the accused, or, if he fled, upon his congregation. The informer received a third of the proceeds. Subscription to any articles affronted the authority of Christ, and opposition to the requirement expressed the true spirit of toleration. The safety of the state alone should be considered; otherwise let people act upon their own principles. Toleration was so consonant with reason and humanity and so widespread that intolerance as expressed by the recent defeat of the dissenters' application now excited surprise. That defeat had come less from aversion than from ignorance was revealed by the argument that the application concerned doctrine, not discipline, and that the legislature in 1689 never intended to tolerate difference in doctrine.

In the body of the tract Furneaux first proved the desirability of toleration from the nature of religion, quoting Mansfield's phrases about the inability to control conscience and the tendency of persecution to make hypocrites or martyrs. Since religion was exclusively a matter of conscience, the favor of God must be secured by following our own judgments, for the judg-

⁹ *An Essay on Toleration with a particular View to the late Application of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers to Parliament for amending, and rendering effectual, the Act of the first of William and Mary, commonly called the Act of Toleration (1773).*

ments of others, either civil or ecclesiastical, weakened if they did not destroy obedience to God. Civil tests compelled a man to violate either his conscience or the law; but could a man obey the law when conscience obliged him to the contrary? Was it possible to obey both God and man? Penal laws could only eradicate genuine religious principles; if obeyed they made hypocrites. Religion must be grounded on personal faith; private judgment and absolute religious liberty belonged to man, who as "a rational and moral agent" owed obligations only to divine authority. Error could not be corrected by terror. Did the nature of civil government depend upon the citizens being at variance with the authority of God? Could the magistrate impose what the subject ought to resist? From the very nature of the situation, toleration would better secure public tranquility.

Furneaux also found a basis for toleration in the origin and ends of civil government. Denying the Filmerian idea that God had given the magistrate complete power over conscience, he believed the surrender of private judgment neither requisite to common safety nor consistent with allegiance to God. Since the magistrate had not been given such power, the ends of his office did not authorize assumption of it. Men entered into society to preserve their natural rights; far from surrendering their rights, they only submitted to regulations the more effectually to secure them. Thus the magistrate should not suppress but protect the exercise of religious liberty. How could the exercise of conscience injure the state, except where it invaded the rights of one's fellowmen? The magistrate could easily prevent this; to maintain an impartial toleration was good policy. Wherever under the pretence of religion persons injured the community, the magistrate might interfere; beyond that, any suppression amounted to tyranny.

Tolerance, he continued, extended to the open profession of every religion, consistent with the safety of the state, and to public instruction in such religion. If the state prohibited this instruction, it exceeded the bounds of its own jurisdiction, for the free education of children was an essential branch of toleration. Deprived of that, people were deprived of a natural right. How could people talk of toleration as existing, and yet deprive a man of the right to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, because of his religion? Existing toleration extended merely to thought, not to action; this was futile, because it resulted only

from the magistrate's ignorance. Full toleration permitted a man to express and defend his religious sentiments. Divine worship needed censorship no more than social meetings or public lectures, for dissenters had conspicuously loved order and disliked licentiousness. A dissenter wishing to preach sedition would not be halted by subscription to the articles. If subscription resulted solely from the necessity for obeying an established religion, how could the rise of Christianity or the Reformation be defended? Tolerating only the opinions locked within "a man's own bosom" meant that people would not torture him to confess his thoughts. Public instruction promoted religious information, but its lack caused "such enormities" in "Popish" countries "as would shock an enlightened heathen." Since Christianity, and especially Protestantism, appealed to reason, it required no standards of belief.

In conclusion Furneaux considered the distinction often made between discipline and doctrine, insisting that toleration extended to both. The failure of the Toleration Act to grant full toleration did not justify any omission. Moreover, if toleration in doctrine was really limited, the majority of the clergy would be ejected from the church, for while the articles were Calvinistic, the clergy were Arminians. The legal toleration of a supposed erroneous religion did not encourage such a religion but only placed it at its starting point. Encouragement came through endowments. The Toleration Act only remedied something that should never have happened. Toleration implied more than connivance; it guaranteed legal security. The penal laws exceeded the just limits of legislative authority and opposed positive law against natural and divine law. Dissenters desired not the connivance of the Indemnity Acts but the security of the British constitution under which unjust laws had no natural place.¹⁰

10 Before leaving Furneaux brief reference may be made to his sermon, *The Duty of Benevolence and Public Spirit: A Sermon, preached at Salters Hall, April 7th, 1775. Before the Correspondent Board in London of the Society in Scotland (incorporated by royal charter) for Propagating Christian Knowledge in the highlands and islands and for spreading the Gospel among the Indians in America* (1775). Taking as his text, "For none of us liveth to himself," Romans xiv, 7, he pictured men as both subjects of God's moral government and reasonable, although on occasion their animal instincts predominated and brought unhappiness. The end of society was defeated when men lived to themselves; they ought to live for the good of others. Mankind formed "one grand community" under God, no matter what language, color, and religion; therefore benevolence ought to be universal. Yet while declaring that all men were

Rather similar in tone and arousing the admiration of Furneaux was *An Inquiry into the Principles of Toleration* by Joseph Fownes, who hoped that nothing in his pages would be found unsuitable to a friend of truth and freedom.¹¹ A follower of John Locke, he particularly desired to answer the arguments that toleration was not a right but a favor, that if it was a right the penal laws were no infringement, and that if they were persecuting laws the Toleration Act provided adequate relief. Fownes himself regarded this act as inadequate, but wished to examine whether the laws it was intended to mitigate actually contravened the principles of toleration. Many people had hinted of the dangers consequent upon the dissenters' attainment of toleration. Nevertheless, present and probable advantages should outweigh distant and improbable disadvantages. Penal laws made as a deterrent ought, if good, to be enforced; if too bad to be enforced they should not be on the statute rolls. If no intention of enforcing them existed, wherein consisted their value as a deterrent? Their presence assumed potential enforcement, however, and laws allowed to lie dormant often had, when enforced, a more vicious effect. Laws ought to prevent, not inflict, tyranny.

Although charity and governmental indulgence had increased, the status of religious liberty indicated that improvement could still take place. The principles of toleration were to be found in the original liberties of mankind which antedated all civil laws and societies, and no apprehension of the truth of another's religious opinions could justify interference with them. Far from reducing this right, the government ought to secure it more firmly. Although people made concessions when they formed civil societies, they did not surrender those rights which antedated civil government and which the government had been organized to protect, but only such rights as personal revenge, henceforth exercised by the government in order that society

kindred, that "Be a man Jew or Gentile, Christian, Mohammedan, or Heathen, he is still a man; and, like ourselves, 'the offspring of God,'" Furneaux deplored the influence of Catholic emissaries in the Scottish highlands as making "bad Christians and bad subjects." And so this persuasive advocate of toleration placed his limits upon the application of the principle which he expounded with such eloquence.

¹¹ *An Inquiry into the Principles of Toleration; the degree, in which they are admitted by our laws; and the reasonableness of the late application made by the Dissenters to Parliament for an enlargement of their religious liberties* (2 ed., Shrewsbury, 1773). I have not been able to find anything in reference to Fownes's life.

might function more effectively. When the government failed to secure primary rights, these returned in cases of necessity to the individual. Inquiry must be made to discover whether necessity existed, but the persistence of those rights was beyond doubt.

"Man was not made for government, but government for man," and laws did not subvert but introduced liberty. Of all inherent rights, liberty of conscience was most incontestable because it touched men as moral beings and would be surrendered last. The magistrate's power over property postulated no power over conscience. Nor did the power to punish disturbances prescribe the power to punish nonconformity. Property, even life itself, might be relinquished, conscience never. Because religion could be made a plea for anything, conscience ought to be carefully scrutinized by the magistrate, but to assert liberty of conscience in words while denying it by penal laws was a gross contradiction. If liberty of conscience led to misdemeanors, it became a political problem and the safety of the state justified intervention. Otherwise the magistrate was an umpire and the common defender of peace, justice, and equity; to attempt to impose a particular faith would violate both his civil functions and the rights of others. If submission to civil government involved submission to a particular religion, what became of both government and religion? Render unto Caesar only the things that were Caesar's.

Expediency justified established religions, but people must regard them as human creations that in no wise contradicted those primary maxims which ought to govern society. Establishments had no right to use force in religion since they were but the creations of the magistrate who himself possessed no such right. To justify the penal laws, nonconformity must be supposed a very heinous crime. If this were granted, Daniel was a criminal to oppose Darius and the Jews were criminals to acknowledge Jesus. Illustrations from English history proved nonconformity no crime. How then could the penal laws be justified? Penal laws and toleration were totally incompatible. The Glorious Revolution had, to be sure, inaugurated a mild relaxation of penal laws by tolerating different varieties of religious worship, but the Toleration Act grew ever more incomplete, for changes in religious belief had been considerable and its concessions varied. Quakers only subscribed against transubstantiation, declared their fidelity to the government, pro-

fessed their belief in the Trinity, and acknowledged the inspiration of the scriptures. Other dissenters suffered from the articles concerning the Trinity and predestination. Moreover, if the establishment were now being formed, would it require subscription to these various articles? The practice of binding ministers to ambiguous doctrines was erroneous, especially since those doctrines would perhaps never be admitted if the question of their being added now arose.

Dissenters' gains in 1689 did not preclude further concessions. The question was one of right. Might not Protestants dissent from a Protestant church? The government connived with the dissenters; but connivance was not toleration, and non-execution was not exemption. To describe the toleration sought by dissenters as next to nothing and yet deny it with great seriousness was most curious. The removal of subscription would not promote heresy and infidelity. The safety of the state justified no laws against humanity, nor did it depend upon subscription to the articles; either toleration must be sacrificed or the penal laws allowed indefensible. It had been said that if the magistrate could not control conscience his authority ended. Yet how could conscience be controlled?

In 1779 the introduction of another relief bill inspired *The Nature and Extent of Intellectual Liberty*.¹² The author, addressing his tract to Sir George Savile, praised him for viewing laws in their principles and for studying human nature, in order to assist in regulating the conduct of men. Parliament, controlled by lawyers and incapacitated for political philosophy, resembled "children furnished with bladders to float upon," never learning to swim. The principles of political philosophy, not law, "should be the study of a senator: the former is the mistress of human genius; the latter is its servile and mechanical instrument."

Concerning dissenters the author showed a refreshing objectivity. He declared that they only wished themselves at liberty. Yet dissenters commanded respect as the rock on which despotism had split since the reign of "Harry the Eighth." Six

¹² David Williams, *The Nature and Extent of Intellectual Liberty in a letter to Sir George Savile, Bart. occasioned by an error on a fundamental principle of Legislation, supported by his credit and eloquence in the debate on the Dissenting Bill, on Wednesday, March 17, 1779* (1779). The author, a prominent dissenting minister, declared that he had "dropped all distinction of religious sects" and had introduced a service based entirely on moral principles.

years before, a bill had sought "not the natural independence and freedom of the human understanding; but the security and establishment of those ministers" of a certain religious belief. He saw "the same illiberal and intolerant views" behind the present bill which, if carried, would injure truth and liberty because it was not a petition for liberty. It erected a test which, however moderate, would silence those ministers who do not or can not subscribe. Earlier tests were so severe that they were neglected; a mild test would be enforced against "free-enquirers." What was intended to suppress intolerance, would revive it.

"The most honourable distinction of the dissenters" has been the public avowal of a truth, the first principle of freedom. The principle on which they had been tolerated was the first principle in the English constitution; perhaps their struggle to secure toleration produced it. No magistrate should enjoin opinions, true or false; permitted to enjoin the first he will claim a right to enforce the latter. When the Scriptures were "improperly made a test of faith" they lost their divine authority, for they were too confused and contradictory. Many dissenters rejected the Song of Solomon and parts of the New Testament. Therefore, they could not "*honestly subscribe the Bible which will be laid before them.*" If they had mental reservations, they had no grievance, for the man who subscribed the Bible of the church, while disbelieving many parts of it, would not suffer by subscribing the articles. The dissenters' petition for relief was proper, but any test would cause persecutions.

According to the author, although Fox or Burke might shine in the realm of wit or rhetoric, Savile surpassed them on the principles of legislation. He stated the eternal axiom that "*opinions must be free, and actions only can be limited . . . This points the nature of intellectual liberty.*" All the plausible statements in favor of intolerance of opinions arose from the argument that limitations upon the body justified those upon the mind. From their very nature, all opinions, or none, must be free; any restraint will destroy the power of thinking. Nevertheless, toleration should extend beyond opinions to their declaration and avowal. "*All men should be at liberty to declare all their principles and opinions;*" any restraint injured the state. A community could profit by the experience of individuals, and this could be known only by open avowal. The community which restrained avowal resembled a man "who shuts up some of his

senses." Efforts at restraint showed ignorance of human nature; opinions caused no trouble until they operated in actions. Even Catholics should have full liberty of expression, for then the magistrate would know what to expect.

Waxing somewhat jocular, the author concluded by inquiring why the government in its apprehension for the education of youth did not put tests to the "abbesses" of "nocturnal seminaries," who contributed so much to the training of youth. Moreover, denial that the three angles of a triangle equalled two right angles aroused no alarm, but denial of the Trinity or original sin immediately caused difficulty. In the case of the present bill, the government did not intend full liberty, and in fact the bill would reduce the existing toleration.¹³

IV

In 1789 the dissenters attempted to secure the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and on this occasion "A Layman" justified their right to complete toleration.¹⁴ He began with an inaccurate survey of their burdens, stating that although they did not suffer, they were indeed in an unfortunate condition. Then he argued that on joining a civil community, man never gave up the rights of private judgment and conscience. Toleration meant "absolute liberty." Mansfield had declared non-conformity to be no crime, and Paley had shown that the tenets of no Christian sect except the Quakers incapacitated its members for civil office.

Repeal of the tests would benefit both church and state by reducing enmity to the first and by bringing greater unity to the latter. To the intolerance of her neighbors England owed many desirable elements in her population, but recently she had lost through a policy no less intolerant. In Scotland a member of the Church of England had full toleration, but members of the Church of Scotland were restricted in England. To belong to the Privy Council of his own country or to hold a commission in the army or navy a Scotsman must take the sacrament in what was for him essentially a foreign church. A dissenter now

¹³ The bill passed, greatly to the satisfaction of most dissenters, and brought no decrease in toleration. In fact, it enlarged the educational opportunities of the dissenters.

¹⁴ *The Right of Protestant Dissenters to a Compleat Toleration asserted* (2 ed., 1789). Authorship has been attributed to Capel Lofft, a publicist and law reporter.

found more favor in France than in England. Although dissenters had lately failed to secure the repeal of the penal acts, they contemplated a second effort. Since prominent persons opposed repeal, dissenters should not put their trust in the king's ministers or the bishops, but rather in their own exertions. Possessing political power, let them use it to the fullest extent.

The dissenters, however, failed in 1789 as they had in 1787. Consequently in 1790 the able and concise *Reasons for seeking a Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts* appeared to reassure those who feared injuries to the church and constitution, and to answer the statement that dissenters were as well off as they deserved.¹⁵ In reply to the inquiry concerning the sentiments of dissenters, the author quoted the "great Chillingworth," the Bible is the religion of Protestants. What was contained therein they accepted, and what was not they rejected; they accepted creeds only as these conformed to the Bible. The articles of the church meant little when that communion comprehended Deism, Supralapsarianism, Socinianism, and Calvinism. Differences existed among dissenters, but if they believed a man in error, they left him to God. Dissenting congregations were as voluntary as those of the primitive church. Any professing Christian might join; if he denied the Lord or committed a crime, he would be excluded as a member though he might still attend worship, and he would sustain no temporal punishment. Such ideas surely threatened no system of government.

Politically, the dissenters conformed to the constitution; uniformly devoted to civil and religious liberty, regardless of their theological differences, they detested licentiousness. They never had been republicans, the United States being no more the work of Massachusetts dissenters than of Virginia Episcopalian or Maryland Catholics. More loyal subjects could not be found in England, and among criminals the proportion of dissenters was smaller than that of other denominations. The penal acts by infringing civil and religious rights violated the constitution. Every good subject should have equal access to office, for government regulated bodies not souls, and considered actions in the light of public welfare not of their acceptability to God. Although dissenters were not fined or imprisoned, they

¹⁵ *Reasons for seeking a Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, submitted to the Consideration of the Candid and Impartial. By a Dissenter* (1790). The author was probably David Bogue (1750-1825), active in nonconformist missionary and educational circles.

suffered persecution through loss of privileges and resembled children cut off from sharing in the property divided among the others.

Men have said that office was not the right of any particular man and that dissenters were not deprived. A wide difference existed, however, between the actual enjoyment of an office and the legal capacity for enjoying it. Those who argued that exclusion was the dissenters' own fault could scarcely be serious. Bound, a person did not walk; his conscience fettered, how could he participate in public office? The dissenters in Scotland and Ireland no longer suffered; France once the home of slaves had struck off her shackles. People who grieved over the slave trade actually loaded the dissenters with calumny. The penal laws prejudiced the best interests of the community when they robbed it of the services of such men as the "great Mr. Howard." Complete toleration would produce a strong unity in spite of religious diversity; it had not injured Holland or any other country. Dissenters had repeatedly shown their attachment to the constitution; if repeal of the tests endangered the constitutional edifice, they would not seek it.

Dissenters would damage the church no more than they would agriculture or the navy. Repeal would not make one dissenter more or one churchman less, nor would it hurt the emolument of the church, whose hierarchy would remain unchanged. The royal family, the nobility, most of the gentry, and the majority of the people belonged to the church. Dissenting candidates for office could be excluded by the suffrage of the people. Where dissenters held office, had they injured the church? Some unreasonable dissenters existed, but to argue that the penal acts protected the church was fallacious and dishonored her. Could she not stand on her own institutions? Perhaps the Presbyterians and Independents in the seventeenth century behaved in a culpable manner, but dissenters had always suffered more from the church than the church from them. To stress Presbyterian fanaticism and laud Anglican moderation was not the whole story; all sects have been intolerant.

Finally, the sacramental test for civil and military offices profaned "one of the most solemn ordinances of the Christian religion," whose true end related wholly to heaven but whose present use related wholly to earth. Christ commanded his disciples to receive it; the acts commanded every atheist and debauchee to

take it. Thousands of anti-religionists took the sacrament every year only because therein lay the way to advancement. An oath of allegiance would secure the same protection without the same profanation. No dissenter would refuse to give a solemn obligation of this kind.

After the effort defended by this tract, dissenters suffered from the widespread hostility generated by the French Revolution against all reform movements, religious as well as political. After the bogey of Jacobinism ceased to frighten, dissenters gathered their forces, closed up their shattered ranks, and organized relief drives. They won some concessions in 1812, but not until 1828 did they achieve their *summum bonum*, the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. Even then they could not claim complete toleration, but at any rate they felt that they had removed the greatest restriction on their political activity and that other gains would follow as a matter of course. While their expectations were not immediately fulfilled, they were undoubtedly justified in their conviction that a better day had dawned.

The contributions to the history and the theory of toleration summarized here perhaps had some value in preparing the way for that better day; but even if they did not actually enlist much favor for broader toleration, they deserve attention as illustrating and amplifying an important episode in the history of religious freedom. The history of toleration will take a long time to write, for its sources lie in many unexpected places. Although such writers as Fownes and Furneaux show no marked originality, their essays nevertheless must be considered in any comprehensive assessment of the whole problem. Lacking objectivity as well as conspicuous originality, these writings reflect the major interests and inspiration not only of their own time but also of many sectors in the history of freedom. Their essential qualities are universal.

"THE NAKED TRUTH": A PLEA FOR CHURCH UNITY

ETHYN WILLIAMS KIRBY
Providence, R. I.

In 1676 an anonymous tract made its appearance on the London bookstalls. The title, *The Naked Truth: Or, The True State of the Primitive Church*, was calculated to appeal to the theologically minded reader, which at that time meant most laymen as well as clergymen. If by posterity the tract has been remembered—when it has been remembered at all—as having inspired Andrew Marvell to create the memorable figure of Mr. Smirke, to its contemporaries it was one of the major events, both from a literary and from a politico-religious standpoint, of its year.

For while it was issued anonymously, there was no doubt that its author was Herbert Croft, Bishop of Hereford. Besides being a bishop he was known as a man well worth listening to, with nothing of the tub-thumper or fanatic about him. A member of an old Herefordshire family, he had staunchly supported the royalist cause during the Great Rebellion. After the Restoration he had been given the rather unimportant bishopric of Hereford, which, surprisingly enough, had contented him. While other royalists had found what comfort they could in the witticism that the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion had meant indemnity for the rebels and oblivion for the faithful, he had placidly refused preferment. He had even given up his post as dean of the Chapel Royal. Gilbert Burnet, who evidently disapproved of Bishop Croft, declared that Croft had rebuked the king in his sermons so indiscreetly that he had "lost ground quickly," and implied that his retreat to Herefordshire was strategic, rather than voluntary; but Anthony Wood found in Croft's retirement the natural result of his "finding but little good effect of his pious endeavours" at court. At any rate, the bishop had retired to his see, where he was the model of episcopal hospitality.¹

¹ *Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1820), part I of Vol. IV, pp. 309-311.

In his retirement, however, he maintained a lively interest in the affairs of the time, particularly in the very critical question of nonconformity. Since the Restoration the problem of dissent had become increasingly vexatious. The complacent belief of most Anglicans that in time all who had strayed from the fold would return to the church had received a jolt. They now were being forced to realize that despite fines and imprisonment, on the one hand, and the conciliatory policy followed by some churchmen,² the dissenters continued their refusal to conform. There were two alternatives: comprehension and toleration. As for the latter the Anglicans regarded the growth of sectarianism, which they felt must inevitably follow toleration, as a deathblow to the national church; while even the Presbyterians and Independents, who would have profited by toleration, disapproved of it because they knew it would include the "fanatics" such as Quakers and the Roman Catholics, whose power they dreaded. The only thing left was comprehension, or a broadening of the national church to include the right wing of Protestant dissent. Thus strengthened, the church need no longer fear the Roman church. As for the Protestant dissenters who would not be brought into the church, they were not regarded as strong or numerous enough to be considered.³ It was this scheme of comprehension which Bishop Croft advocated in his pamphlet.

The idea, of course, was not a new one. Since the Restoration comprehension had constantly been in the minds of those who wished peace and unity. Twice, in 1668 and again in 1673, bills to achieve a broadening of the church to include the moderate dissenters had appeared in Parliament. Bishops Wilkins, Morley, and Ward had from time to time busied themselves with the problem; and among the nonconformists, Richard Baxter, Thomas Manton, and William Bates had

² Such bishops as those of Norwich and of London (who instructed Kidder to administer the sacrament even to those who would not kneel, Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 4) definitely adopted a conciliatory attitude toward those who had scruples about ceremonial matters. See A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), for other instances of moderation, pp. 129, 253, 416, 438, 475, 483; and White Kennett, *Register Ecclesiastical and Civil* (London, 1724), 804-805, 814.

³ William Penn in *England's Present Interest Considered* (London, 1675), attacked the idea of comprehension; with his usual astuteness he omitted any mention of what its effect would be on Quakerism, but devoted himself to elucidating the differences between Presbyterians and Anglicans which he declared would be increased, not decreased, by such a scheme.

striven to find some way in which they and the many who felt as they did might remain in the church. Among the younger clergy Edward Stillingfleet and John Tillotson, now deans of Canterbury and St. Paul's respectively, had shown themselves singularly open-minded. But each attempt at compromise had failed.⁴

The problem seemed the more complex in that most of the Independents and Presbyterians excluded themselves not because they were too liberal, but because they were too conservative. So far as doctrine was concerned, the Calvinist could feel at home in the church. But his conscience, he maintained, would not permit him to tolerate a church in which men of Arminian tendencies were found or in which ceremonies not definitely enjoined by the Bible were permitted. And so, on the one hand there were Anglicans who regarded all dissenters as rebels and who thought that if the slightest effort were made toward compromise the church would be ruined; on the other hand, there were dissenters who regarded all ceremonial as sinful and all non-Calvinists as heretics, and who would have, to be sure, a national church, but a national church formed according to their own strict pattern. In between these two extremes the party in the Presbyterian group led by Richard Baxter and the moderate Anglicans dreamed of comprehension.

It was in this atmosphere of mingled distrust and optimism that Bishop Croft penned his plea for comprehension. Dedicated to Parliament, it was supposed to influence the members to pass a bill modifying the church. For two years, the author explained, he had pondered the question of comprehension. Finally he had overcome his "bias of interest and education." Convinced that the church must condescend toward its weaker brethren, the separatists, he had written this pamphlet to convince the law-makers that in their hands lay the remedy for England's sad turmoil. But even the strength of his convictions did not give him courage to risk the criticisms which he knew would follow the pamphlet's appearance. Recognizing that he was "a weak man, of great passions, not able to bear commendations or reproach," he sent forth his petition

⁴ Richard Baxter's *Autobiography* (London, 1696) contains the most details about these efforts to work out a compromise; the account by John Birch in his life of Tillotson (in vol. I of Tillotson's *Works*, London, 1820) is evidently taken from Baxter's story. Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* (London, 1661) is undoubtedly the classic statement of the attitude of the moderate party in the Anglican church.

anonymously. Nor did he have it licensed. For this omission he begged Parliament's forgiveness.⁵

The divisions in the church, he declared, were driving men to Rome, for they found in the authority of that communion the answer to the divisiveness of Protestantism. Just as wise princes, "when confronted by great enemies," make peace with their lesser enemies, so the Anglican church, Croft urged, should seek to conciliate and bring within its fold all Protestants. Then it could cope effectively with its great enemy, Roman Catholicism.

The points of difference among Protestants he recognized to be dogma, liturgy, and church government. Unity could be found only by returning to the primitive church. And optimistically overlooking the divisions in the church even in the days of the apostles and church fathers, he developed his thesis that by ridding itself of all ceremonial, dogma, and elements of church polity which had been introduced into the church since then, the church could induce Protestant dissenters to return to it.

As to dogma, the Apostles' Creed should be the test. By thus scrapping all the elaborate system erected by Calvin, Croft was asking Thomas Manton and others of his kind to give up a great deal. But he did not specifically state what doctrines should be regarded as non-essential. Within the creed, he felt, was found the faith formulated "by primitive apostolick men and proposed as the sum of Christian faith, the sum total necessary to salvation." He deprecated the zeal of the theorizers who "take upon themselves the liberty to propose new questions, to make nice distinctions and rash conclusions of divine matters, tossing them up and down with their tongues like tennis balls."

Showing a sympathy rare in his century, he favored gentle treatment for heretics. It was irrational, he maintained, "to endeavour to promote the truth of the Gospel contrary to the laws of the Gospel." After excommunication heretics must be left in peace; for if they "keep their erroneous opinions to themselves . . . but only refuse to conform to the churches established doctrine, and discipline" they would harm no one. Only when they proselyted should the magistrate act against them. For Bishop Croft had strayed far enough away from

⁵ The pamphlet has been reprinted in *Somers, Tracts* (London, 1812), VII, 268ff.

Calvinism to decide that in matters of faith nothing was absolute. Even the church fathers and the councils had erred. Had not St. Augustine "believed it a direct heresy to hold there were any Antipodes?" Summing up his beliefs, the bishop declared: "I am taught to believe only in God, not in the Church, much less in any member, or congregation, or council: but to believe in the holy Catholic Church, that is, that God hath had, now hath, and will have to the world's end, a select company of faithful ones, confessing him and serving him . . ."

In dealing with the highly controversial question of ceremonies, he showed equal frankness. "I wonder men of any tolerable discretion," he remarked, "should be so eager for or against them, our salvation no way depending on them, but much hazarded by our contention about them, breaking peace, the principal thing recommended to us by the gospel of peace: sure both are very sinful." "For my part," he reasonably declared, "I think all subjects are bound in conscience to conform to the established ceremonies of that church whereof they are members, unless there be anything flatly against the word of God." Agreeable as this statement was to his Anglican readers, he followed it by one less pleasing: "Be pious, be charitable," he urged, "be prudent, build your Church upon a rock that will endure storms, and not on a sand of ceremonies, that will both raise storms and probably overturn your Church ere long." A "charitable compliancie" was urged upon both dissenting and Anglican readers:

Uniformity in ceremony is a good and desirable thing, therefore endeavour it, but unity in faith and charity is better, and therefore if you cannot obtain that, be sure to preserve this . . . for this force, urging uniformity in worship, hath caused great division in faith as well as charity: for had you, by abolishing some ceremonies, taken the weak brethren into your church, they had not wandered about after seducing teachers, nor fallen into so many gross opinions of their own, but, being daily catechized and instructed by your orthodox and sound teaching, they would have followed you like good sheep, whereas now they wander about into a hundred by-paths of error, many whereof lead headlong to hell.

Bishop Croft nevertheless recognized the necessity of a "set form of prayer." "For were there liberty left to the more able and discreet, most would prescribe themselves to be such . . .," he regretted, "and were it left to the bishop to

license as he saw fit, it would prove a great cause of heart-burning among his clergy, and hatred towards himself, yea and rebellion against him and the laws." While he was not explicit as to the liturgy which should be adopted in order to please all, he clearly recognized the need of change in the Book of Common Prayer.

After soundly scorning the poor sermons preached by the clergy, he turned to the highly controversial question of church government. There had always been, he contended, one person set over the other clergy, "to ordain, to exhort, to rebuke, to judge and censure as he found cause," whether his title were "elder, or presbyter, or president." His emphasis upon the secular, rather than the sacerdotal, function of the bishop approached that of John Selden and other Erastians. As to the problem which had troubled so many conscientious bishops and priests in 1660—whether the clergy ordained according to the Presbyterian rite during the Great Rebellion should be admitted into the church without episcopal ordination—he recognized its difficulty. "Though it ought not to be done (but only of necessity), yet being done 'tis valid." Although "I am as zealous for the preserving this primitive way as any man, yet I cannot," he declared, "by any means consent to them who would have episcopacy to be a distinct order."

His emphasis upon the priesthood as essentially a teaching rather than a sacramental function, which he had already voiced in his section on preaching, appeared again in his discussion of confirmation. Because it was not a sacrament, he felt it might well be done by rural deans, or even the parochial clergy, who would "examine and license for the Lord's table."⁶ This concession, while it might win the favor of the Calvinists and of those practical-minded folk who recognized how impossible it was for the bishop to make annual visitations to each parish in his diocese, would offend those who were catholic-minded. Yet if he seemed willing to shear the bishop of this important rite, he nevertheless affirmed the power of the bishop "to govern as well as ordain." In conclusion he urged bishops and other clergy to urge Parliament "to petition his majesty for the redress of these abuses by pious laws, settling

⁶ Although this is an interesting parallel to the rite of chrismation in the Orthodox Church, which may be administered by the priest, clearly Bishop Croft was influenced by Geneva, not Byzantium.

the church-government in the primitive purity and authority."

Unlike most advocates of comprehension, who tended to blame the Anglican church for sins of omission and commission and to regard the separatists as pious martyrs, he found much to criticise in the behavior of the dissenters. "My beloved in Christ, you see how earnestly I have pleaded for you to the fathers and governors of our church, . . . that they may receive you into it," he declared in a "Charitable admonition to all non-conformists," which he added to his pamphlet. "Yet," he added, "I have no great hopes that they will hearken to me, you yourselves for whom I plead destroy my hope: for they will dash me in the teeth, saying, to rather . . . persuade the sons in duty to submit to the fathers, than fathers to yield to sons; and can you deny but of the two you are rather to submit." He replied to their protests that it was against their consciences to kneel and in other ways to conform, by asking them to "shew me in his holy word any one clear sentence against any one ceremony commanded in our church." "Wilfulness and faction" were responsible for non-conformity. "I can never yield," he declared, "that you have any reasonable and true conscientious cause of separation." With an authority which betrayed the fact that he was a bishop, he called upon the separatists to submit to the "ordinances of those superiors and powers which God hath set over you." "Even if in so doing they were guilty of some errors therein (I am confident there are none, yet were it so), my soul for yours," he assured his readers, "that guilt shall never be laid to your charge by our most gracious Saviour and merciful Judge, Jesus Christ our Lord."

The pamphlet, at once authoritative and sympathetic, struck a new note in the controversy over comprehension. It frankly recognized that the church had more to gain than lose by concessions to the Protestant dissenters, yet it called for equal concessions on the part of dissent. The famous pamphleteers among the nonconformists, such as Richard Baxter and John Corbet, had been more concerned with making demands upon the Anglican church than with recognizing that they too must concede.⁷ Not that their sincerity should be

⁷ Baxter's *Cure of Church Divisions* (London, 1670), *Defence of the Principles of Love* (London, 1671), and *The Petition for Peace and the Reformation of the Liturgy* (London, 1661) had as their thesis the need for making the Anglican church Puritan in liturgy and government. John Corbet, *Interest of England in*

questioned. The problem was the age-old one of the beam and the mote.

The most significant contribution by an Anglican up to this time had been Edward Stillingfleet's *Irenicum: A Weapon and Salve for the Church's Wounds*, which appeared in 1661. The pamphlet concerned itself, however, mainly with theorizing about the law of nature and its application to the problem of the relations of church and state and of toleration. It dealt with the problem of church polity by recommending that Archbishop Ussher's scheme of 1641, which limited the power of the bishops, be adopted. In this respect Stillingfleet's tract may have influenced *The Naked Truth*. For, while Bishop Croft made no specific proposal as to how the bishop's power was to be limited and while he had advocated that the bishop should not be shorn of his administrative power, essentially he recognized the advisability of compromise in this respect, as in others.

Bishop Croft was a Latitudinarian in that he felt that the church was bigger than faction. Anglican and dissenter, he maintained, must lay aside pettiness and earnestly strive for the welfare of Protestant Christendom. He was the child of his age in his fear of popery but his willingness to lay aside his royalist suspicions and Anglican prejudices showed his essential broadmindedness.

Bishop Croft intended to have copies of this tract distributed among members of Parliament, which was in session as he penned it. "Understanding the Parliament inclined to a temper in religion," he hoped his petition might act as a spur to comprehension. Unfortunately after four hundred copies had been printed, Charles II prorogued Parliament on November 22 for fifteen months. The bishop at once gave orders that the tract be suppressed until Parliament met again.

But that was an age in which despite the stern watchfulness of Roger L'Estrange and his minions and the Stationers' Company, illegal printing thrived. "A covetous Printer," Andrew Marvell called him, succeeding in getting a copy of *The Naked Truth*; aware of the sale which such a pamphlet

the Matters of Religion (London, 1660) and *Discourse of the Religion of England* (London, 1667) sought to reduce to a minimum the points of difference between Anglican and nonconformist by emphasizing the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

would have, he proceeded to print and distribute a number of copies.⁸ Four printers seem finally to have been involved in the printing and distribution of the pamphlet, which evidently sold at 20d. a copy: Francis Smith, known as "Elephant" Smith because his printing press lay concealed near the Elephant and Castle; Thomas Sawbridge, John Marlow, and Henry Burgess.⁹

The pamphlet made a tremendous sensation. Anthony Wood compared its appearance to that of a comet. A proclamation was posted in the coffee houses offering rewards of twenty pounds and fifty pounds for information about the printer and the author,¹⁰ while the *habitués* speculated about who its author was and discussed the issue involved in the tract. In private houses, especially where clergy were gathered, the tract dominated conversation.

The nonconformists, despite the severity of Croft's rebukes, seemed to approve of the pamphlet. William Jenkyn, a Presbyterian who had hitherto stood aloof from all talk of comprehension, is reported to have called it "*tractatus egregius*." Other dissenters regarded it as equal to John Hales' famous tract, *Of Schism*.¹¹ Richard Baxter, too, gave it his approval.¹²

While some of the moderate Anglicans approved of the book—Gilbert Burnet declared that the book had been much read and by some "no less commended"¹³—most of Croft's fellow-churchmen were horrified at his proposals. "Some of the morning and evening chaplains burnt their lips with perpetual discoursing it out of reputation," reported Marvell, "and loading the Author, whoever he were, with all contempt, malice and obloquy."¹⁴ In February (1676), Peter Gunning, the new Bishop of Ely, made it the occasion of a sermon before the king. Although he referred to the pamphlet as having appeared anonymously, at least one of his hearers, John Evelyn, was quite aware that it was the Bishop of Hereford

⁸ Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: Or the Divine in Mode* (*Works*, London, 1875), IV, 19-20.

⁹ Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports, Appendix 9, House of Lords Calendar, 77-78.

¹⁰ George Kitchin, *Roger L'Estrange* (London, 1913), 199n.

¹¹ Wood, *op. cit.*, IV, 312.

¹² John Stoughton, *The Church of the Restoration* (London, 1870), I, 499.

¹³ Gilbert Burnet, *A Modest Survey . . .* (London, 1676), 1.

¹⁴ Marvell, *op. cit.*, IV, 10-11.

who was being castigated.¹⁵ The sermon is supposed to have so much delighted Charles II that he commanded Bishop Gunning to have it printed.¹⁶ No evidence has been found, however, that it ever was published.

Meanwhile clergy had been preparing a defence of the church against Croft's attack, and early in 1676 three replies appeared. Francis Turner, head of St. John's College, Cambridge, wrote *Animadversions upon a Late Pamphlet entituled the Naked Truth*, two editions of which appeared. Philip Fell was inspired to reply in *Lex Talionis: Or, The Author of the Naked Truth Stript Naked*, while Gilbert Burnet indulged in *A Modest Survey*. . . .

Turner's pamphlet may be regarded as the official pronouncement of the bishop of Ely, who was his patron. Nevertheless, his pamphlet was the only one of the three to appear without the *imprimatur* of Dr. Jane. (Dr. Jane, of course, as the chaplain of the bishop of London licensed theological books.) Written in an informal style, it attacked Bishop Croft's scholarship and his orthodoxy. It disposed of the first chapter of *The Naked Truth*, on "Articles of Faith," by declaring that it had been written by some "youngster who had been dabbling among the Socinian Writers." With an amazing disregard of the many acts of injustice inflicted upon the dissenters since 1662 he declared that non-conformists had been treated with a "patience and gentleness" which had "emboldened them to stand upon such terms and at such a distance as amazes the Protestants abroad." Turner found further ground for criticism in Croft's broad viewpoint. "Presbyterians (who seem to stand out only upon Punctilioes of ceremonies)," he wrote in astonishment, as well as "Independents, Anabaptists and I know not how many more Sects (if they call themselves Protestants) would be taken into the Church." Recalling the sermon preached by Benjamin Laney, Gunning's predecessor at Ely, a year before, which had attacked comprehension, he used his figure of speech by declaring the church would become "the Drag-net, large and capacious enough to hold the Leviathan himself." The result would be the "Abolishing all our Ceremonies, and blending our Orders." Eventually

¹⁵ John Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, entry for 20 February, 1676. The text Evelyn gives, St. John 20, vv. 21, 22, 23, seems rather inappropriate for such a sermon as that reported to have been preached.

¹⁶ Wood, *op. cit.*, IV, 313.

it would end in "more Divisions, and consequently, more Separations from the Church of England."

The pamphlet was immediately spread far and wide. Ministers of state had copies thrust upon them. The author, Marvell declared, sent it "by express to his friends at the universities, but especially to his own college, and can scarce refrain from recommending it to the tutors to instruct their pupils, reading it to them in lieu of other lectures. . . . The country cathedrals learn it latest, and arrive by slower degrees to their understanding, by the carrier. It grows a business to the chapter, and they admire it in a body as a profound body of theology." Those, Marvell added cynically, "that can confide in one another, discourse it over in private, and then 'tis odds, but, before the laity get notice of it, they first hear it preached over by him whose turn it is next Sunday in the Minster; the rest conceal the fraud for the reputation of the diocess." Meanwhile "the little emissaries here in town are not idle, but hawke about from London to Westminster with their britches stiffe with the copyes, and will sell them to any one for commendation."¹⁷ Marvell's evidence, although extremely biassed, bears witness to the importance of the controversy.

The High Church party decided that Turner's pamphlet must have reinforcements. In response to their urging Philip Fell, brother of the famous Dr. John Fell and a distinguished Latin poet, wrote *Lex Talionis: Or, The Author of the Naked Truth Stript Naked*. Two points not dealt with in Turner's reply were taken up in this pamphlet. First he purposed to show that Croft was "utterly ignorant of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, and grossly mistaked in the representations he makes thereof"; and secondly, that while the author had declared that there was nothing in his "Libel" contrary to law, "several things therein contain'd are as contrary to the known Laws as his Printing without License was . . ." The book, he declared, was "pernicious: tending to the disturbance of the established constitution of the Church and State."

The Naked Truth, he declared, must have been written by "some Sceptic and atheistical derider of Religion," or by "a crazed Enthusiast," or "some ambitious discontented Person

¹⁷ Marvell, *op. cit.*, IV, 61.

of the Church of England, who has not been preferred according to his Merit, or what may be greater than that, his expectation, his mind being leaven'd with Spite and anger." Like Turner, Fell completely failed to see Croft's sincerity of purpose. As to the author's craftsmanship, the writer "runs on like a Horse with an empty Cart, exceedingly pleased with the rattling of the Wheels, and gingling of the Bells." As a parting shot, Fell declared that the pamphlet had only given dissenters more grounds for separation.

The third writer to enter the lists against Croft was Gilbert Burnet. The future bishop of Salisbury, having left his native Scotland, was now lecturer on Thursday at St. Clements Dane, preaching with great success throughout London and supporting himself with his pen. It is extraordinary that although he was at this time a friend of Tillotson and Stillingfleet, he joined the high churchmen in attacking Croft. Recently, indeed, a scholar discussing the tract has expressed doubt as to whether Burnet was the author.¹⁸ It must be remembered, however, that even if Burnet was a broad churchman and a Whig, he was by no means a liberal. Some years later, for instance, he commended the unbridled attacks which Charles Leslie was making upon the Quakers. He was at heart a conformist. The explanation which the author of *A Modest Survey* . . . gives for his taking up the cudgels against Croft—that he had been urged by one who had "absolute power with me"—is one which might apply to a young and ambitious man, such as Burnet, trying to carve out a career for himself in an alien land. The tone of the pamphlet on the whole inclines toward conciliation. It has none of the sharpness which characterizes Turner's and Fell's.¹⁹

Unlike his two colleagues, Burnet found good in the author. He was assured that the writer was "in good earnest, and does sincerely desire the peace of our Church" as well as the defeat of popery. "He writes gravely," Burnet com-

¹⁸ C. E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism . . . 1660-1688* (New York, 1931), 517. T. E. S. Clarke and H. C. Foxcroft, in their *Life of Gilbert Burnet* (Cambridge, 1907), 140-147, accept Burnet's authorship. Wood declared that he saw it included in Burnet's works in a publisher's list.

¹⁹ Anthony Wood's story, quoted from Hiekes' *Discourses on Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson* (*op. cit.*, IV, 314n), that Burnet having conferred with Dr. Gunning, proceeded to steal his thunder, seems unlikely. Certainly Burnet would not have spoken of himself as urged to answer Croft (almost as if against his will) had he indulged in such unethical conduct.

mented, "and like a man that has deep impressions of Religion upon him; and so I am heartily sorry so good a Man, as I verily believe he is should have been prevailed on, to have done so unadvised a thing as was first the writing, and then the publishing of such a Discourse." Far from checking separation, this pamphlet would be "like both to encourage those that do unreasonably separate from us: and make some of them who adhere to our Communion stumble and shake."

Burnet, alone among the three who replied to Croft, pointed out that there was no need of modifying the doctrines of the church. Indeed, he declared with some truth, the dissenters objected to the Church of England as not being rigorous enough in its doctrinal demands. As to changes in the liturgy he agreed with Fell and Turner that "in all such Rents as are now in our Church, it is a very unreasonable demand to desire anything that is established should be changed without a very great cause." If "a considerable body of our Dissenters" were to ask certain concessions on condition that they return to the church, then Burnet felt there might be talk of change. Otherwise, popery was strengthened and schism increased. For the dissenters, Burnet agreed with other enemies of comprehension, became the more obstinate as they saw the church giving ground.

The last twenty pages of this little pamphlet defended episcopacy. Burnet's study of the early church had convinced him that as long as "the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost continued; there could not be such a critical distinction of Functions as came to be settled afterwards, when that ceased." Only as generations appeared who had not known the Pentecostal vision had it become necessary to have "Offices and Functions" in the church. That the reformed churches on the Continent did not have bishops was, in his opinion, quite irrelevant. When the Reformation took place in France, the Protestants were not allowed to come over to England for ordination; the same situation prevailed even in Protestant countries where the princes feared that the power of bishops would decrease their own influence upon the church. Burnet could regard the Reformed churches as true churches because they were "irregular out of necessity." English nonconformists, however, had no such excuse for their invalid orders.

Burnet agreed with Turner and Fell that the influence of *The Naked Truth* had been a highly pernicious one. They found much to regret in its unscholarly nature. But, worse, it had "made all enemies of Peace triumph," Burnet declared, "and has put some popular things in the mouths of his Readers, with which they think themselves sufficiently armed to baffle both the Articles and Rules of our Church."

Among the many who must have welcomed Croft's appeal for moderation, only one pamphleteer bestirred himself to reply to his attackers. Andrew Marvell, using the pseudonym of Andreas Rivetus, Junior, wrote *Mr. Smirke: or The Divine in Mode*. Mr. Smirke, who must be regarded as the ancestor of all the Mr. Slopes, was supposed to represent Francis Turner. As early as mid-May a stationer in Chancery Lane had been taken into custody for printing this unlicensed tract,²⁰ but it was printed just the same and appeared to amuse and shock the reading world. Turner, finding it on Brome's book-stall, took it home to read; he became so engrossed that he failed to come down to dinner. Henry Compton, the bishop of London, not only read it carefully, but presented a copy of it, with certain libellous passages marked, to the Privy Council. He failed, however, to get any notice of his objections.²¹ The fact that Turner was chaplain to Charles II led certain readers to feel that Mr. Smirke's being named in the same breath as Sir Fopling Flutter, a character in a comedy by George Etheredge, implied a certain disrespect to His Majesty.²² But if Marvell hoped his readers would find that impression in his work, he cloaked it in most obscure language.

The pamphlet began satirically. As governors in olden times entertained their people "with Publick Recreations," so the ecclesiastical governors of our time, Marvell noted, have done. "They have ordained from time to time several of the most ingenious and pregnant of their clergy to supply the press continually with new books of ridiculous facetious argument. Wherein divers of them have succeeded to admiration: insomuch that by the reading thereof, the ancient sobriety and seriousness of the English hath been in some good measure . . .

²⁰ *Hatton Correspondence* (2 vols. Camden Society Publications, 1878), I, 125, 127.

²¹ Marvell, *Poems and Letters* (Oxford, 1927), 323.

²² Christopher Hatton, on May 23, 1676, expressed anger that Marvell had called Turner "Chaplain to Sr. Fopling Busy." *Hatton Correspondence*, I, 128.

worn out of fashion." Some clergy, he added slyly, did this for promotion.

After much banter, in which Mr. Smirke, the name he gave to Turner, was subjected to cruel ridicule, he became grave. That anyone should have written against *The Naked Truth* astonished him. The pamphlet itself "is a Book, that were it not for its opposer, needs no commendation . . . It is a book of that kind that no Christian scarce can peruse it without wishing himself had been the author." The writer must indeed be "a true Son, if not a Father, of the Church of England."

But the church, Marvell regretfully noted, had not appreciated the tract. Instead, a clergyman had been encouraged to write an answer to it, "and that not according to the ordinary rules of civility, or in the sober way of arguing Controversie, but with the utmost severity of jeere, disdain, indignation." That it had been written in Lent merely aggravated its offence. As for the other answer to Croft, "the Author of *The Truth Stripped naked* (to the fell or to the skin) that hieroglyphical quibble of the 'great gun' on the title page,²³ will not excuse Bishop Gunning. For his sermon is still expected." In conclusion Marvell quoted from Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*: "The time will come when three words, uttered with charity and meekness, shall receive a far more blessed reward, than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." "And," he added, "I shall conclude with him in his close, 'I trust in the Almighty, that with us as contentions are now at the highest float, and that the day will come (for what cause is there of despair?) when the passions of former enmity being allaid, men shall with ten times redoubled tokens of unfainedly reconciled love, shew themselves each to other the same which Joseph and the brethren were at the time of their interview in Egypt!' And upon this condition 'let my book also' (yea, myself, if it were needful) 'be burnt by the hand of the' Animadverter."

Bishop Croft deeply appreciated the wit and loyalty of his defender. Thanking him for "the humane civility and Christian charity showed to the Author of the Naked Truth, soe

²³ The reference to the "great gun" is a play on Bishop Gunning's name and the picture of the cannon which decorated the title page of tracts published by Brome, whose shop was at the Sign of the Gun.

bespotted with the dirty language of foule mouthed beasts," he declared that Marvell had his "zealous prayers and hearty service." Marvell in his reply was no less gracious. The service, he insisted, lay not in what it had done but in Croft's acceptance of it. "As long as God shall lend you life and health," he rejoiced, "I reckon our Church is indefectible."²⁴

Mr. Smirke: Or, The Divine in Mode ended the controversy over *The Naked Truth*. Other matters diverted men's attention; for, as Turner had declared in his *Animadversions* . . . , in London the citizens spent "much of their time, as the men of Athens did, either in hearing or telling some new Thing." War, fear of popery, Shaftesbury's intrigues engaged their attention; and Gilbert Burnet turned his energies to join Stillingfleet in a verbal controversy with some Roman priests. But the dream of comprehension was by no means dead. Through the troubled seventies and eighties, and even after the passage of the Toleration Act seemed to have ended the possibilities of Protestant unity, men strove to find a remedy for Protestant divisiveness.

Croft's pamphlet has a small, but nevertheless significant, place in this history of efforts to secure unity. It typified the strength and the weakness of the movement for comprehension. In his desire to be charitable toward the dissenters, he, at times, failed to be charitable toward many of his own communion. Thus he antagonized many Anglicans and jeopardized the success of the thing for which he was working. The sectaries, for their part, disliked being told that they too were in the wrong; although they could not feel themselves entirely out of the church as long as a bishop recognized their desire to return to a Puritanized church.

The greatest difficulty, of course, lay in the question of what these modifications should be, which would make possible the end of Protestant dissent and the consequent growth in power of the national church. Even Bishop Croft, for all his two years' meditation, had no definite proposals to make. While on the one hand he argued for the simplicity of the primitive church, he recognized the chaos of a church without a definite liturgical basis. Profound as his sympathy was with the dissenters, his loyalty to his church, his almost unconscious de-

²⁴ Marvell, *Works*, II, 489-491.

votion to its liturgy and government made it impossible for him to realize that the nonconformists had by now travelled far from the Puritanism of 1640. Terms which they would possibly have accepted in 1641 or again in 1661, at the Savoy Conference, would not now satisfy them. His opponents, Turner, Fell, and Burnet, if they were less charitable, understood more clearly the cleavage between Anglicanism and Protestant dissent. Nevertheless the church needed its Herbert Crofts. And the widespread interest in the pamphlet, the fact that three able clergymen thought it worth their while to refute it, and the readiness with which that busy member of Parliament for Hull, Andrew Marvell, rushed to defend it, show that at that time its significance was appreciated.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

December 28-29, 1937

The American Society of Church History held its thirty-first annual business meeting at Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania, and in conjunction with the American Historical Association at 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday and Wednesday, December 28 and 29, 1937.

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

The meeting on Tuesday, December 28, in Crozer Theological Seminary was opened at 10:30 A. M., by President Herbert W. Schneider. After a word of welcome in behalf of Crozer Theological Seminary, our host, Reuben E. E. Harkness, presented the president with a historic gavel made from the wood of a tree under which John Leland and James Madison agreed that the latter should attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia.

The first paper on the program, by Elmer E. S. Johnson of Hartford Theological Seminary, could not be heard because of his inability to be present. The papers read were these:

John T. McNeill, Divinity School of the University of Chicago:

The Emergence of Conciliarism.

Harold S. Bender, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana:

Conrad Grebel, the Founder of the Anabaptist Movement.

The president appointed the following as members of the nominating committee: F. W. Loetscher, chairman, W. E. Garrison, John T. McNeill; and the following as members of the auditing committee: W. W. Rockwell, H. Shelton Smith.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

After the luncheon the afternoon session was opened at 2:30 by President Schneider. The following papers were read and discussed:

H. Shelton Smith, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina:

The Nature and Function of the Church in the Thought of James H. Thornwell.

Raymond L. Hightower, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.:

Controversy and the Rise of Sects in the United States.

J. Orin Oliphant, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.:
The American Missionary Spirit, 1828-35.

At 4:30, President and Mrs. James Henry Franklin of Crozer Theological Seminary entertained the members and friends at a tea in their home.

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION

After dinner the Society reassembled in the parlor of the Seminary where after a program provided by the Seminary, the chairman, Reuben E. E. Harkness, called upon the president, Herbert Wallace Schneider of Columbia University, New York, for the presidential address. He dealt with *The Intellectual Background of William Ellery Channing*.

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

The Society reassembled at 10:00 in the chapel, President Schneider presiding. Thereupon the annual business session of the Society was held.

In the absence of the secretary, Abdel Ross Wentz, Matthew Spinka assumed his duties. The minutes of the December, 1936, and March, 1937, meetings were approved as published in *Church History*. The assistant secretary presented the nominations of the Council for officers, for members of the Council at large, and for members of standing committees. He was instructed to cast the ballot of the Society for all those nominated, and the president then declared them to be duly elected.

(The list of the new officers and members of the Council is to be found in the Minutes of the Council for December 28, 1937.)

Thereupon, the newly-elected president, Reuben E. E. Harkness, was called to the chair. The report of the editorial board was read by Matthew Spinka, and was received. The Council's action in regard to the increase of appropriation for the next year was approved. (See Minutes of the Council.)

Treasurer Robert Hastings Nichols submitted his annual report in printed form as follows:

Report of the Treasurer of the American Society of Church History for the year December 19, 1936--December 11, 1937

I. CURRENT FUNDS

A. SUMMARY AND BALANCE

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand, December 18, 1936	\$1,150.19
Membership dues	840.25
Sale of <i>Papers</i>	2.10
Bank interest	15.51
Income from <i>Church History</i>	305.55
<i>Studies</i> —See Schedule C	457.65
Total	<u>\$2,771.25</u>

DISBURSEMENTS

Expenses of management of Society	\$ 230.92
Publication of <i>Church History</i>	869.45
<i>Studies</i> —See Schedule C	478.01

Total \$1,578.38

Cash on hand, December 11, 1937:

National Bank of Auburn, checking
account, per bank statement \$ 405.21
National Bank of Auburn, interest
account, per bank book 787.66

1,192.87

\$2,771.25

B. GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

RECEIPTS

Dues for Active Memberships

1934—	3 members	\$ 9.00
1935—	5 members	15.00
1936—	23 members	69.00
1937—	245 members	731.25
1938—	2 members	6.00

Dues for Sustaining Memberships

1937—	1 member	10.00
-------	----------------	-------

\$ 840.25

Sale of <i>Papers</i>	2.10
-----------------------------	------

Bank interest	15.51
---------------------	-------

\$ 857.86

Subscriptions to <i>Church History</i> (101) \$ 295.80
--

Sale of copies	9.75
----------------------	------

305.55

Total of Receipts	\$1,163.41
-------------------------	------------

DISBURSEMENTS

Management of Society

Postage and express charges	\$ 40.45
Telephone tolls and telegrams	8.15
Printing	55.44
Stationery and supplies	35.00
Stenographic services	87.75
Conference of Historical Societies	1.00
Check returned	3.00
Exchange on check13

\$ 230.92Publication of *Church History*

Printing and distribution	\$ 688.91
Postage and express charges	61.68
Telephone tolls and telegrams	15.15
Stationery and supplies	10.68
Letterheads, circulars, etc.	6.17

CHURCH HISTORY

Stenographic services	79.00
Petty cash for managing editor	5.61
Refund	2.25
	<hr/>
	\$ 869.45
Total of Disbursements	\$1,100.37

C. STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

RECEIPTS

Sales of Volume I (including postage)	\$ 21.28
Sales of Volume II (including postage)	21.09
Sales of Monograph I (includ. postage)	11.82
Sales of Rockwell pamphlet (incl. post.)	1.16
	<hr/>
	\$ 55.35
Author's payment for publication, Monograph II	402.30
	<hr/>
	\$ 457.65

DISBURSEMENTS

Volume I

Postage	\$.96
Stenographic services	2.10
Editorial services	1.75
Settlement with author	15.79
	<hr/>
	\$ 20.60

Volume II

Postage	\$.76
Stenographic services	2.00
Editorial services	1.38
Settlement with author	12.42
	<hr/>
	16.56

Monograph I

Postage	\$.43
Stenographic services	2.55
Editorial services73
Settlement with author	6.61
	<hr/>
	10.32

Rockwell pamphlet	
Editorial services	\$.11
Settlement with author95
	<hr/>
	1.06

Monograph II	
Publication cost	\$ 402.30
Postage and express charges	4.25
Stenographic services	1.85
Telegrams	2.37
Copyright	2.06
Advertising	16.64
	<hr/>
	429.47
	<hr/>
	\$ 478.01

II. ENDOWMENT FUND

Total of fund, December 19, 1936	\$1,480.41
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank	9.80
Interest on investment	30.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,520.21

Invested in Mortgage Certificate of New York Title and Mortgage Co., in liquidation, New York Trust Co., trustee	\$1,000.00
Cash in Auburn Savings Bank, December 11, 1937, per bank book	520.21
	<hr/>
	\$1,520.21

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS, *Treasurer.*

The auditing committee reported that the treasurer's books were found in order. The treasurer's report was then received for record with thanks and the auditing committee's report was adopted.

It was voted to approve the Council's recommendation regarding the transfer of funds from the balance in the treasury to the endowment fund. (See Minutes of the Council.) The report of the membership committee was read and approved. (See Minutes of the Council.)

It was voted that the business meeting of December, 1938, be held in the East and that a joint literary session be arranged with the American Historical Association in Chicago. Arrangements for these meetings were left to the program committee with power.

The secretary was instructed to send a letter of appreciation to Abdel Ross Wentz for his work as secretary of the Society.

Furthermore, it was voted that the Society desires to place on record its sincere thanks to President James Henry Franklin, the Faculty and friends of Crozer Theological Seminary, and particularly to Professor Reuben E. E. Harkness, for their gracious hospitality and the excellent arrangements for the Society's meeting and the comfort of the members.

The secretary was instructed to transmit to President Franklin and Professor Harkness a copy of this resolution.

At 10:30 the literary session was resumed. These papers were read and discussed:

Irving S. Kull, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.:
Variations in the Presbyterian Attitude toward Slavery.

Allan R. Moore, Watsontown, Pennsylvania:
The Virginia Baptists in the War between the States, 1861-1865.

JOINT SESSION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The afternoon session was held at 2:30 p. m. at 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as a joint session with the American Historical Association. Herbert Wallace Schneider presided. The following papers were read and discussed:

Erwin R. Goodenough, Yale University:
Philo's Political Theory and Practice.

F. W. Buckler, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio:
The Establishment of the Church of England: Its Constitutional and Legal Significance.

Ray H. Abrams, University of Pennsylvania:
Suppression of Minority Opinion in Time of Crisis in America.

Cecil A. Bining, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,
Pa.

History and the Changing World.

Adjourned to meet at the call of the President.

Attest: MATTHEW SPINKA, *Secretary.*

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY

December 28, 1937

The Council met at the call of President Herbert W. Schneider at Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania, at 9:00 P. M. on Tuesday, December 28, 1937.

The following members were present: H. W. Schneider, R. E. E. Harkness, Abdel Ross Wentz, R. H. Nichols, Matthew Spinka, John T. McNeill, Charles Lyttle, Roland H. Bainton, Frederick W. Loetscher and W. E. Garrison.

The minutes of the meeting of December 28, 1936, were approved as published in the March, 1937, issue of *Church History*.

The secretary reported that the following members had died during the year: Thomas Porter, George Linn Kieffer, Augustus Steimle, Frank S. Brewer and Edward S. Worcester.

The secretary reported that the following members had resigned during the year: Kiropp Lake, John S. Higgins, Edward Niles, Amos B. Hulen, H. N. Renfrew, Frederick Lewis Weis, Lawrence E. Murphy, Louis I. Newman and H. R. Gummey. It was voted to accept these resignations with regret.

It was decided to publish the roll of members annually in the June issue of *Church History*, instead of in the December issue.

It was decided that in publishing the Minutes, a clause be added to the list of newly elected members as follows: "subject to the fulfilment of the constitutional requirements concerning membership."

The treasurer submitted his report in printed form (see Minutes of the Society), and upon the report of the auditing committee consisting of W. W. Rockwell and H. Shelton Smith, the report was received for record with an expression of thanks. The report of the auditing committee was adopted.

The report of the editorial board was approved and its

recommendation of an increase of the appropriation for the current year was adopted, as follows:

"The Editorial Board of *Church History* carried on its duties during the year in a way which calls for no extended report or comment. The quarterly is gaining increased attention on the part of other professional periodicals, in this country and abroad. The total number of members and subscribers shows gratifying gains, having increased from 359 to 389, which number is to be increased by eighteen new candidates to be voted on at this meeting. In 1932 the publication was begun with 233 members and subscribers, so that during the six years of the existence of the quarterly, the total number of new members and subscribers has been increased by 174.

In view of the considerably increased need of clerical services in connection with the editorial work and sales and subscription promotion, we recommend that the appropriation for the year 1938 be increased from \$900 to \$1,000.

We also wish to report that during the current year we published as Volume II of *Monographs of Church History*, P. E. Shaw's *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-70*. Volume III of *Studies in Church History*, comprising W. E. L. Smith's *Episcopal Appointments in the Reign of Edward II*, is at present in the process of publication.

Matthew Spinka
Robert Hastings Nichols
Herbert W. Schneider, *ex officio.*"

The managing editor was authorized to negotiate with University Books, Inc., of New York City, concerning an arrangement whereby this organization would undertake the sale of the book publications of the Society. The board was given power to act.

The membership committee reported the following list of candidates who were duly elected to the membership in the Society, subject to the fulfillment of the constitutional requirements concerning membership:

- Rev. Haig Adadourian, 1005 North Hudson Ave., Pasadena, California.
Rev. William C. Adams, P. O. Box 67, Cambridge, Mass.
Dr. J. T. Addison, 8 Mercer Circle, Cambridge, Mass.

Gaylord P. Albaugh, Snell Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Prof. Fritiof Ander, Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois.

Prof. George B. Arbaugh, Carthage College, Carthage, Illinois.

Prof. G. L. Glauner, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Va.

Guy S. Klett, 208 S. 42nd Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Dr. W. C. Laube, University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa.

Prof. Richard D. Leonard, 821 College Avenue, Beloit, Wisconsin.

Prof. Kathleen W. MacArthur, Hollins College, Virginia.

Rev. William D. Maxwell, Hillhead Manse, Glasgow, Scotland.

Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D., St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, New York.

Dr. Herbert M. Morais, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

Dr. P. G. Morrison, The Divinity Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Rev. James K. Morse, 45 Fairmount Ave., Hackensack, New Jersey.

Dr. William A. Mueller, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Rittenhouse Sq., Philadelphia, Penna.

Prof. W. H. Roberts, Ph.D., Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.

The treasurer reported that the following members were in arrears for dues for the last three years: Dr. E. Clowes Chorley, Pres. Leonard F. Morse, Rev. Walter M. Rucci, Rev. F. W. Schaefer, Rev. T. Yamanaga. By action of the Council these members were dropped from the membership list.

The nominating committee reported as follows:

Officers for 1938

President	Reuben E. E. Harkness
Vice-President	Charles Lytle
Secretary	Matthew Spinka
Treasurer	Robert Hastings Nichols
Assistant Secretary	Robert Fortenbaugh

Other Members of the Council

William David Schermerhorn	Wilhelm Pauck
William Warren Sweet	Herbert Wallace Schneider
Conrad Henry Moehlman	Roland H. Bainton
Frederick William Loetscher	F. W. Buckler
John Thomas McNeill	E. R. Hardy, Jr.

Program Committee: Herbert Wallace Schneider, chairman; Charles Lyttle, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Editorial Board: Matthew Spinka, Managing Editor; Robert Hastings Nichols, and Reuben E. E. Harkness, *ex officio*.

Membership Committee: W. W. Rockwell, chairman; 3041 Broadway, New York City; John T. McNeill, P. N. Garber, the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Committee on the Investment of Endowment Funds: Robert Hastings Nichols, chairman; H. B. Washburn, and Shirley Jackson Case.

The Council voted to place these nominations before the Society.

It was decided to recommend to the Society that funds from the balance in the treasury be transferred to the endowment fund in sufficient amount to make a total investment of \$1000.

On motion, the Council expressed its interest in the proposal presented by Roland H. Bainton for the formation of a society to study the history of the period from 1450 to 1600.

It was voted to recommend to the Society that the next meeting be held in connection with the American Historical Association in Chicago in December, 1938, and that the Auburn-Colgate-Rochester invitation be accepted for December, 1939, if renewed.

Adjourned to meet at the call of the president.

Attest: ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, *Secretary*.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN HOPE FOR WORLD SOCIETY

By JOHN T. MCNEILL. Chicago: Willet, Clark & Company, 1937. vii, 278 pages. \$2.50.

Our generation is badly in need of a word of hope and Professor McNeill shows that Christianity has been incorrigibly hopeful. In spite of prophetic castigation, other-worldliness and aloofness, Christianity has never abandoned effort and hope for society. The hope may have been conceived in terms of apocalypticism or of progress. Still it has been hope. The content of the expectation is drawn by Professor McNeill chiefly in political terms. To the end of the Middle Ages the survey is primarily a review of Christian political thought, with side glances at economic and labor problems. After the Reformation, the scope broadens and attention is paid to education, missions, humanitarianism, and economic change. The treatment takes largely the form of analyzing the literary landmarks of Christian social thinking. The method has the advantage of presenting a large body of concrete information, much more than one will find in Troeltsch's *Social Teachings*. The disadvantage is that the information is sometimes miscellaneous and the main lines are obscured. The great uniting thread is the political interest. Eschatology and progress are noticed continuously, but the treatment of the restoration of primitive Christianity comes up only in connection with Sylvester II and Hildebrand. The picture of the third age of the Holy Spirit is noticed only in connection with Joachim. The concept of the *civitas terrena* versus the *civitas Dei* is traced only through Augustine. The idea of natural law is treated only in connection with Grotius.

The political interest is probably responsible for the fact that the dominant Christian groups come near to preempting the stage. In the Middle Ages only Joachim and the Spirituals and after the Reformation only the Quakers receive consideration. One would think that the Hussites, the Anabaptists and the other seventeenth century English radicals might have had a place, certainly, if nowhere else, in the chapter on religious liberty.

The judgments are always well balanced. There is no exaggeration of early Christian eschatology, nor of the secularization under Constantine. The gory crusades are portrayed as an improvement over the lawless brutality of the previous century. I am glad that the author has had the courage to say a good word for the eighteenth century in the face of the current scorn of its fatuous optimism and shallow rationalism. Very well, but let us not forget that this was the century which dealt the death blow to witchcraft and torture. I am glad, too, that the conclusion makes a plea for humane learning and social reconciliation. They look futile enough just

now, but if they do go down there is something to be said for sinking on the right ship.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY
VOL. I, THE AGE OF TRANSITION

Edited by W. O. E. OESTERLY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937. xii, 304 pages. \$4.00.

This volume is intended to be the first of a series dealing with the relation of Judaism to Christianity. It is made up of separate papers by various authors: The Historical Background, Religion in the Graeco-Roman World, The Wisdom Literature, The Apocalyptic Literature, Pharisaism, The Belief in Angels and Demons, The Way of the Initiate, Christianity and the Mystery Religions, the Emergence of Christianity from Judaism. These last three papers are all by Prof. S. H. Hooke, and turn on the same general theme of the radical difference between Judaism and the mystery religions. On this ground the author builds up a powerful argument against the view that Christianity, in its essence a Jewish religion, was seriously affected by the pagan cults. A noteworthy article is that of Prof. E. O. Jones on "Religion in the Graeco-Roman world," in which the development of religious ideas is traced in brief but suggestive outline from the time of Homer onward. Nearly a third of the book is occupied with the article on Pharisaism by Herbert Loewe, the Cambridge lecturer on Rabbinics. It is brilliantly written, and presents the Jewish point of view with a spiritual fervour which enlists the sympathy of the Christian reader. We could have wished that Mr. Loewe had not felt it necessary to confine himself to aspects of Pharisaism which have not been adequately discussed by Moore, Herford, Schechter, and other scholars, a knowledge of whose work he assumes. A full treatment of the subject by such a competent and discerning writer would have been exceedingly welcome. The remaining articles are contributed by Dr. Oesterley, the general editor, whose name is sufficient guarantee for a comprehensive knowledge of later Judaism. He has been prevented by illness from writing a Preface to the projected series, and all readers of the present volume will sincerely hope that he may be able to continue an undertaking which promises to be of singular interest and value.

Union Theological Seminary.

E. F. Scott.

CHRISTENDOM AND ISLAM

By W. WILSON CASH. New York: Harper Bros., 1937. 204 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Cash is a great missionary leader of the Church of England. He writes from a direct experience of Islam in Egypt and the Near East, of over twenty years. The key to the volume is in his personal testimony: "In

my earlier days as a missionary I studied controversy and examined the Koran critically for the purpose of argument and debate. But I came to realize the utter futility of it all and ultimately to discard controversy entirely as a method of approach to Moslems . . . I soon found myself in an atmosphere where controversy was eliminated and where Christians and Moslems embarked upon a common quest for God, where they shared spiritual experiences and lived only for a fuller realization of communion with the Infinite." Hence this historical and understanding approach.

The student of history will follow with great interest the five chapters which delineate the cultural interchange between Islam and "Christian" Europe. These constitute a fresh approach which makes a real contribution to Islamic studies. The portrayal of present trends, political, social and religious, in Islam shows the author to be a careful and accurate observer in this field. In the closing chapter the missionary sets forth "The Christian Answer to the Moslem Quest." This he finds in three major ideas: the Eternal Christ, the fatherhood of God as conceived by Christ, and a religion of personal experience. The spirit of the approach must be in humility and full brotherliness. In this section the Jesus of history seems to be in eclipse by the somewhat exclusive emphasis upon the "Eternal Christ." One cannot help contrasting this position with Dr. Laubach's description (heard in a recent address) of the effectiveness of his presentation of the synoptic portrait of Jesus to his Moro Moslem friends.

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

W. D. Schermerhorn.

MOSCOW THE THIRD ROME

By NICHOLAS ZERNOV. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937. 94 pages.
\$90.

This short treatise, packing within its small size a great deal of material based upon accurate knowledge of the whole extensive field, is an unusually valuable piece of work. The dominant theme is the ancient theory that the headship of Christendom, originally held by Rome, was passed on to Constantinople, and after its "betrayal" of Orthodoxy by the latter in the Union of Florence (1439), it was transferred to Moscow. But the author takes a running start from the time of the Christianization of Russia and has produced a well-proportioned brief survey of the entire history of the Russian Orthodox church. He defends the thesis that Russian Christianity is not a mere replica, but rather an interpretation of the Byzantine pattern in a form characteristically indigenous, impressing the Russian genius upon the Byzantine inheritance. Particularly interesting is the author's tracing of the conflict between the pro-governmental Josephine party with the party of St. Nil, in the terms of which the entire history of the Russian church may be conceived. Altogether, this work is among the most reliable short surveys of Russian church histories in English.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.

BARTHOLOMEW OF EXETER

By DOM ADRIAN MOREY. Cambridge : at the University Press ; New York : The Macmillan Company, 1937. 321 pages. \$6.50.

This objective and carefully documented study from Downside Abbey gives the place of Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter, in the political and legal developments of the reign of Henry II. It was the time of the Becket controversy and the rapid advance of canon law in England that followed. There is a sketch of Bartholomew as a diocesan bishop. His *Penitential*, well annotated as to sources and related writings, is printed in full for the first time.

In the Becket dispute Bartholomew worked for moderation but sided with the pope and archbishop. He was intimate with John of Salisbury who sent him much confidential information and counsel. The bishop's activities as a judge-delegate of the pope were extensive, and in describing them Dom Morey has given a lucid account of the purpose and value of such appointments. The very extensive powers of these judges, representing the omni-competent papal court, may have caused complaint, but one can understand that such powers were necessary sometimes to overcome the many obstacles to justice in the Middle Ages. A short chapter on the bishop's literary work contains some very attractive extracts from his Latin sermons.

The bibliography does not mention the authoritative *Celtic Penitentials* by Professor J. T. McNeill. One misses also definite references for the bishop's activities as a judge in the royal court, mentioned on page 77, Disputes as to competence of secular and ecclesiastical courts were acute in the twelfth century, especially over such border-line cases as legitimacy and advowson. It would have been of value to know where the bishop of Exeter stood, if this can be ascertained. There is the question also of the influence of his *Penitential*. No doubt we shall hear more from Dom Morey on these questions. This book is a valuable study of a significant period.

Selby, Ontario.

W. E. L. Smith.

SAINT CATHERINE OF SIENA

By ALICE CURTAYNE. New York : Sheed and Ward, 1935. xvi, 214 pages. \$1.50.

All the noble and all the fantastic qualities which aroused the admiration and credulity of the medieval mind were epitomized in Catherine Benincasa of Siena. To the modern man, however, she remains at best an enigma; and the honest historian finds it well nigh impossible to understand the sources, as authentic as copious, from Catherine's own and her contemporaries' hands. In these pages very near the impossible has been achieved, however, in the remarkably human way in which Catherine relives as the capable leader of a band of devoted friends drawn from all sorts and conditions of men. Miss Curtayne writes, too, in a beautiful style, and her characterizations of the circle of *caterinati* are often vivid and

penetrating. A truly admirable example of this is the way she describes Catherine's intense interest in people: "Great artist in life, she was never weary of the human face."

The author's analysis of Catherine's sense of failure in the temporal scene which haunted her last days is excellently done from a psychological standpoint; but the objective factors which made her failure inevitable are not made clear. Like many medieval worthies, Catherine only increased her fame and influence by her austerities and charities, and she was thus unwittingly forced despite her lack of education into the very heart of world events of the day. And she shared in many momentous ones. It was the great tragedy of her life to see the Great Schism effectively bring to ruin the tottering structure of papal prestige which she had sought to reinforce by inducing the pope to abandon Avignon for Rome. In the eyes of many she seemed convicted of having meddled in things too great for her, and she herself felt conscious of the justice of this condemnation, though she knew very well that the church's cause was little served by turning the papacy into a department of the French government.

Catherine's failure was one common to many reformers. That is, she always acted on the basis of her spiritual intuitions, never on a reasoned analysis of social forces operating in the world situation. She believed that reform in the church was all that was necessary to make the world prostrate itself at the feet of the papacy and go on crusade against the infidel. One cannot but admire her singleness of purpose. But such ideas were a century or more out of date. With all her medieval idealism of a universal theocracy, her grasp of the contemporary European scene was hopelessly provincial, if not, indeed, Siennese. An Italian living in the fourteenth century could hardly be expected to view the world otherwise. Imagine her characterization of the Hundred Years' War to the king of France as *la briga vostra* ("your quarrel")! Nor could she ever understand why her devoted confessor, Father Delle Vigne, a man as dispassionate and cautious as she was impetuous and impulsive, could not break his way into France in the interests of Urban VI just by the sheer weight of the truth of his cause. It is well for a saint to see the spiritual elements involved in world processes, but it is fatal to disregard at the same time economic, social, and cultural pressures.

It should be pointed out that this study was first published in 1929 and contained a set of appendices with critical discussions of the sources. These are omitted in the present edition, partly to reduce the price and partly to make possible the expansion of the appendix into another book, which is promised to appear in the near future.

University of Chicago.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

OLD PARISH LIFE IN LONDON

By CHARLES PENDRILL. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. x, 295 pages. \$8.00.

This attractive volume is Mr. Pendrill's fourth book in the field of London history. In an agreeable style and with ample information he

treats in nine chapters the cardinal aspects of life in the 106 parishes of medieval and early modern London. The pageantry and poverty, humor and pathos, piety and cruelty of medieval town society could hardly be more lucidly revealed than in the intimate pictures and briefly narrated incidents which appear in these pages. Parish happenings often flash a clear light upon the Reformation movement. The author finds, for example, that Somerset's idea of freedom led only to brawling in the churches; that in many cases officials charged with arrest of heretics warned them and only when the offenders had made their escape took measures to search the parish for them; that in 1559 the populace, reacting from Mary's oppression, in a "frenzied intolerance" burnt rare art objects and relics; that the type of testator who before the Reformation would provide obits for the peace of his soul, later left funds to secure the services of a "godly preacher"; and that under Elizabeth many parishes raised "lecture rates" to maintain lectureships on religious subjects. Matters connected with the government and administration of the parishes are treated with admirable clarity. Two specially interesting chapters are devoted to parish activities on behalf of the poor. A point of interest here is the "grandiose" but not unfruitful scheme, originated (1552) by Bishop Ridley, which began with a census of the London poor and resulted in a city-wide centralized administration of the poor funds and agencies of relief. The parish authorities were traditionally considerate of their own poor, but often took drastic means to rid the community of vagrants, especially of women approaching childbirth. When the latter were not forcibly ejected from the parish or paid to leave it, they were lodged in the "cage" or straw-strewn unfurnished room provided for that purpose. Other topics luminously treated are "the Parishioner's Home," the "Parishioner's Shopping," and "the Parishioner's End." If Mr. Pendrill has his prejudices, they are robust and not misleading. When he says that if the Puritans had remained a little longer in power Christianity "would have been whittled down until it disappeared altogether," we suspect him of a certain wilful neglect of Puritan authors. But as a whole the story is told without bias and with the mature and intimate knowledge that gives it permanent value. It is intended for the cultivated reader rather than the specialist, but historians will find it highly useful.

The University of Chicago.

John T. McNeill.

WILLIAM TYNDALE

By J. F. MOZLEY. New York: Macmillan, 1937. 364 pages. \$4.00.

The renewed interest in William Tyndale arising out of last year's observance of the quater-centenary of his death called for a new life of the translator. For there had been no substantial work on him since the biography which Robert Demaus published in 1871. Mr. Mozley has now undertaken to supply this need. Though few major discoveries were to be hoped for after Demaus' careful work, he has gone over the source material once more, and has turned up several minor items of interest from the State Papers.

In his effort to incorporate the fruits of recent studies in the field he

has been largely successful. The fine work of the Dutch bibliographer, Miss M. E. Kronenberg, in proving that the press of "Hans Luft of Marburg," from which many of Tyndale's books purport to come, was really that of John Hoochstraten of Antwerp has made possible a much more accurate account of the exile's wanderings and publishing activities during the important years from 1528 to 1530. Several smaller contributions are similarly used. The author has, however, overlooked the strong case presented by A. Koszul (*Review of English Studies*, IV [1928], 25-34) for the identification of Friar Jerome Barlow with the famous Bishop William Barlow. He works out afresh the argument for equating Tyndale with the *Guillelmus Daltici ex Anglia*, whose name appears in the Wittenberg University register for 1525, without being aware that he has been anticipated in this suggestion by Preserved Smith ("Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century," *English Historical Review*, XXXVI [1921], 422). Nor does he appear to know of the doubt which has been cast (*Church History*, V [1936], 201 n.1) on the story of Tyndale's connection with Cambridge University.

On several moot points of Tyndale's scholarship Mr. Mozley makes valuable suggestions. He argues cogently for the traditional spelling of the name itself. He shows that the Cologne fragment was probably the only quarto New Testament of 1525-6. He offers good reasons for accepting the story of the Hamburg visit during the translation of the Pentateuch in 1529-30, and he easily refutes the suggestion that the Matthew Bible was the work of Thomas Matthew of Colchester. He is less happy in his assignment to Tyndale of *The Souper of the Lord*, for the available evidence (*Notes and Queries*, I, 1 [1850], 362-3) points rather to Jove as the author. And his assumption that Stokesley, Bishop of London, hired Phillips to betray Tyndale seems highly questionable in view of the hostility with which the traitor was regarded by the English authorities and his close association with the continental Roman Catholic leaders at Louvain and elsewhere.

Mr. Mozley has yielded somewhat to the biographer's temptation to paint the lily. He passes lightly over his hero's quarrelsomeness, his coarse controversial language, and the bitterness which he displayed even toward his fellow reformers. He minimizes Tyndale's dependence on Luther and his theological aberration in the matter of soul-sleeping. These are pardonable weaknesses, but it is indeed disappointing to find the author assuming such an uncompromisingly Protestant position. Scholarship has certainly failed in its healing mission if one who is as well versed in its lore as Mr. Mozley cannot more adequately appreciate the values associated with the old religion—however much he may prefer the teachings of the new.

The University of Chicago.

M. M. Knappen.

WERDENTES QUAKERTUM

By THEODORE SIPPEL. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammers Verlag, 1937. vii, 262 pages. R. M. 13.50.

Theodore Sippel is an outstanding authority on the forerunners of the Quakers, and the allied movements on the Continent and in England in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He has a peculiar gift for feeling out and "spotting" significant influences which have eluded historians.

He considers John Everard the greatest English mystic of the seventeenth century (born 1575), and he believes that the Quaker movement and other mystical sects owe their birth to this unique preacher.

The first chapter of the book under review is a careful study of Everard's mysticism, and the first section of the Appendix (pp. 113-147) contains long extracts in English from Everard's sermons. His sermons were first published in 1653 under the title *Some Gospel Treasures Open*. This volume is now extremely rare. There can, I think, be no question that Everard is the major figure for understanding the mystical awakening in England in the first half of the seventeenth century.¹

The other mystical interpreters and forerunners of George Fox dealt with in the book are Roger Brereley (often spelled Brierley), John Saltmarsh, and William Dell. Long extracts from Brereley's sermons are given in Appendix II. The author holds that the Westmorland groups, who later became Quakers, were formed under the spiritual influence of Brereley.

There is an important chapter on the Ranters, and there are thirty-two pages of quotations (pp. 182-214) from the writings of the Ranters. There is, too, an important chapter on "The Collapse of English Puritanism" and another on "The Message of Quakerism," illustrated by a valuable list of quotations from early Quaker writers (pp. 215-262).

The book is important for any one who is doing research work in this critical period of English history. There is still much further research needed, especially on the influence of the writings of Jacob Boehme, and on the mystical groups of the "Familists" and the books of Henry Nicholas, their founder.

Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Rufus M. Jones.

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SCOTLAND

By G. D. HENDERSON. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937. 311 pages. \$4.25.

Professor Henderson's collection of essays is a welcome addition in a rich field that has been too little explored. The work does not pretend to be definitive, but it does throw clarifying light on several aspects of Scottish religious and intellectual history during a period when "the armed evangelists" of the north were exercising a profoundly important influence upon English religious development.

During most of the seventeenth century orthodox Dutch influence, as crystallized in the formulations of the Synod of Dort, weighed heavily upon Scottish thought. Professor Henderson shows that relations between the two countries were very intimate, and Scottish theology was

¹ See my *Spiritual Reformers*, and *Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth*.

moulded by the apparent triumph of a resolute, if intolerant, orthodoxy. In Scotland, Arminianism became a term of especial opprobrium with which one denounced particularly distasteful theological opponents, without very thoughtful reference to the actual content of their religious beliefs. And, curiously, the peculiarly adamantine quality of Dutch orthodoxy was to persist in Scotland for at least two generations after Arminianism and the doctrinal relativism which flowed from it had sapped the intolerant strength of Calvinism in Holland.

Professor Henderson makes a very useful contribution in his careful discussion of the history of Independency in seventeenth century Scotland, though his attention (and this applied equally to the book as a whole) would seem to be focused a little too closely on Aberdeen. He shows that there were surprisingly thrifty roots of Congregationalism as early as 1640, and that during the next decade the church was sorely beset by the very "devils of toleration" with whom the Scottish Commissioners were engaged at Westminster. Congregationalism naturally gained in strength after the invasion of Cromwell's half military, half missionary army and was to develop under three or four leaders of considerable distinction who displayed, unhappily, a tendency to slip back into the safer folds of orthodoxy in 1660.

One of the most valuable essays deals with the admirable system of education which was in process of development during this century. Though thorough, Scottish education was still rigid and scholastic and was dedicated to the end of theology. The Scot of the seventeenth century was almost grimly literate, was inclined to be almost disagreeably expert in his theology, and was most precise in his ability to separate "absolute truth" from "absolute error." It may be held that Scotland slumbered in an imagined paradise of orthodoxy and certainty of truth which had in fact ceased to exist. The universities in Scotland had not felt the beneficent touch of humanism; Scotland, it may be argued, had had her Reformation without her Renaissance.

Professor Henderson's volume is somewhat marred by a lack of organic unity, accountable of course by the fact that it is composed of a number of only partially related essays. The style is uneven in quality and is occasionally marred by a staccato briskness which would suggest that portions of the text were originally written as lectures. The research has been carefully done and the voluminous notes form a significant contribution to our knowledge of the period.

Scripps College (Claremont Colleges).

W. K. Jordan.

THE THEORY OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN ENGLAND 1603-1639

By T. LYON. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937. 242 pages. \$2.25.

The current tendency to reexamine the ideological bases of modern liberalism is well illustrated by the fact that so many historians are con-

cerning themselves with the question of toleration. In the seventeenth century English field Professor W. K. Jordan is continuing his study (*The Development of Religious Toleration in England*, volumes I and II reviewed in *Church History*, I, 235-7; VI, 76-77) to 1660, while another American scholar is preparing a work on the last forty years. Now Mr. Lyon has made an independent survey of much of the ground covered by Jordan's second volume, and has incorporated his results in a prize essay which was written before the appearance of the American work. While the task is carefully and thoughtfully done, it represents, in fact, a sad duplication of effort. It professes to differ from its predecessor in being confined to questions of theory alone, but these are so closely related to matters of practice that treatments of the latter topics inevitably creep in. Perhaps the chief contribution is a somewhat finer distinction between the theories of the non-Separatist Independent adherents of Henry Jacob and the Separatist followers of Henry Barrow. It is made clear that the Separatists put more restrictions on the power of the secular magistrate, granting him power to defend the true religion, but not to compel men to become members of it when established. For the most part, however, the student in this field must still be referred to Jordan's larger work.

The University of Chicago.

M. M. Knappen.

JOHN WESLEY'S AWAKENING

By JAMES RICHARD JOY. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1937.
126 pages. \$0.50.

A three-fold aim is implied in the foreword to this compact account of the important events in the life of John Wesley. It intends to serve as an introduction to the many larger "Lives"; to present "in brief compass and in non-theological language" the personality and work of Wesley, and to emphasize especially the spiritual experience at Aldersgate which "marked the turning-point of his career."

In two of these aims the author has succeeded admirably. Brevity, compactness, and inclusiveness characterize the work. It is an excellent handbook for introductory purposes, although the questions suggested for use of study group leaders are almost entirely factual, and external to the main topic.

The treatment of the central theme, however, is somewhat disappointing. One is led by title and foreword to expect a more profound and comprehensive analysis of the Aldersgate experience, whereas the author contents himself with generally reaffirming as many before him have done, the "crisis" nature of the "awakening." Perhaps we have fallen into a deplorably futile and even harmful habit of psychologizing all the deeds and words of the mighty dead, but surely in this particular experience a judicious use of psychological tools would aid greatly in making the experience more intelligible, less mysterious, and consequently more potentially available to

other men. There is no discussion of the highly susceptible nature of Wesley as he was confronted with the effective techniques of the kind of "Society" which was meeting at Aldersgate. In fact, the character of the "revolutionary change" is meagerly dealt with after all. A thoroughgoing analysis of this event would be a really fresh contribution to Wesleyan literature.

Further, the author's determination to avoid theological language in describing this experience has betrayed him into avoiding theology almost altogether. He thus deprives himself of the strong support of Wesley's theological position—a fairly constant element, as an aid in interpreting his religious experience. He fails to come to grips with the implications of the supernatural contained in the description of Aldersgate, and he misses the always rewarding exercise of contrasting or comparing this "crisis" experience of Wesley with those recorded as preceding the decisive step in the career of almost every historic religious leader. The elements of conflict, temptation, depression, self-distrust, and fear, with their resolution at last by means of clarification, release, confidence, and unified purpose, and the mysterious precipitation brought about by some spiritual chemistry at the appropriate moment—these are factors in an admittedly difficult problem. Incisive treatment of this problem is necessary before any fresh inspiration can come from surveying the spiritual history of John Wesley.

The virtue of simplification has somewhat defeated itself by too rigorous application to what is far from being a simple experience. The author would have had a more effective book had he left it to others to prepare a handbook of factual data for an introductory survey, and treated the "awakening" with the theological and psychological seriousness proper to a subject which he regards as of central importance.

Despite the weakness due to divided aims, the book has, in addition to the merits already described, the additional contemporary merit of being one of those "little books" that are useful and valuable to minister and teacher, and full of information and spiritual suggestiveness to the general reader.

Hollins College, Virginia.

Kathleen Walker MacArthur.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN AMERICA

By H. RICHARD NIEBUHR. Chicago and New York: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937. xvii, 215 pages, \$2.

"The kingdom of God on earth," frequently proposed as a clue to the inner unity of the history of Christianity in the United States, Professor Niebuhr found inadequate to the facts, so his preface says. Searching deeper, he found a more complex formula. This is still the kingdom of God, but in three successive phases: "sovereignty of God," in early colonial times; "kingdom of Christ," from the Great Awakening to the Civil War; "kingdom on earth" is subsequent years.

The treatment of the first phase rests on an illuminating chapter

concerning early Protestantism. Its main interest is seen as the sovereignty of God, in contrast to the Catholic interest in the vision of God. In undertaking to make the divine sovereignty the basis for an order of life, early Protestantism found itself in a "dilemma," "hard put to it to provide principles for human construction." The solutions of the problem by Lutheranism, Calvinism and separatism are so described to contribute to what follows. This kind of endeavor continued in America, a free field for "an experiment in constructive Protestantism." The exposition of the "sovereignty of God" in America is occupied with the thought of Puritans, Quakers and separatists, though it is recognized that other religious bodies shared "the faith of the Protestant renewal with its fresh insistence on the present sovereignty and initiative of God," and also "faced the dilemma of Protestantism." What these three groups conceived of was not a utopia of man's making. For that both God and human evil were too real to them. "It was rather the living reality of God's present rule, not only in human spirits but also in the world of nature and of human history." This Professor Niebuhr draws out in three practical principles. One is "Christian constitutionalism, i. e. that the meaning of the divine sovereignty was found in the Bible. The Puritan tendency toward "narrow constructionism" was balanced by Quaker and separatist emphasis on the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Another is "the independence of the church"; the American development of the free church is rightly traced to seeds here. The third is "the limitations of human power," in the discussion of which are penetrating observations on democracy and liberty as related to divine sovereignty.

The change to the second phase, "kingdom of Christ," is associated with a social change of the eighteenth century, the appearance of "a new world of emancipated individuals." The preaching of the Gospel in the Awakening and the revivals which followed it with some interruptions to the Civil War made "the idea of regeneration primary." Another change in the form of the Christian message is expressed in the standard phrases "kingdom of Christ," "kingdom of the Redeemer." These mark an emphasis on the gracious aspects of God's revelation, which is shown to have been not alien to Puritanism, contrary to the conventional view. But despite changes there was a continuity, for the kingdom of Christ was founded upon the divine sovereignty. The description of this form of Christianity gathers into a significant unity personalities and movements usually treated as unrelated, and sets out in clear relief a formative period which put a permanent stamp on American Christianity. Professor Niebuhr gives its due to something not always appreciated in describing how the "kingdom of Christ," while aloof from politics, expressed love for men in philanthropies, missions, social reforms and the anti-slavery crusade. The chapter on "The Coming Kingdom" pictures a Christian confidence in a transformation of society so vivid that in many quarters it assumed a millennial character. The common mistake that "prior to 1907 or 1890 the hope of a kingdom on earth was practically non-existent while Christians directed all their expectation toward the heavenly city" is corrected.

The continuity with the third phase, "kingdom on earth," is in the carry-over of this Christian confidence. This third also is associated with a social change. The doctrine of the "kingdom of Christ" "could not emancipate itself from the conviction that the human unit is the individual." To deepening social problems and growing social consciousness the answer came in various versions of the social gospel. The remainder of the book is a history of what the author sees as a degeneration. In its later years the "kingdom of Christ" movement suffered from institutionalizing, ecclesiasticizing, and from secularizing. Thus its religious dynamic was lowered. The stage was taken by a "romantic liberalism," in whose ancestry were Channing and Emerson, and by what is called a "mediating tendency," first represented by Gladden and Rauschenbusch, but more marked in later men. In different ways there was reflected here "loss of the religious heritage," a weaker sense of both human evil and divine salvation. In diagnosing the modern religious situation Professor Niebuhr says familiar things, but with accuracy and deep earnestness and the force of historical grounding. The book closes on the note of reassurance, referring to signs of deepening religious conviction.

Obviously this book omits from its survey large parts of American Christianity. It does not profess to be comprehensive. It does deal with the most articulate and most influential part of our religious development. As for the manner of its dealing, the main question about any historical pattern is not whether it fits everywhere, but whether it helps to understanding. There will be differing judgments about details of Professor Niebuhr's pattern. The millennial character of the "kingdom of Christ" seems rather overdone. The works of service of this movement appear much more after the revivals about 1800 than in the eighteenth century, which suggests other causes beside the religious change. Despite questions, Professor Niebuhr's pattern, in his handling, proves a highly useful instrument of understanding. His book rests on very extensive and discerning reading of the sources, and he is familiar with previous historians and critics. His original approach and sympathetic insight constantly diffuse light. He has given us one of our most valuable interpretations of American religious history.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

CHARLES INGLIS, MISSIONARY, LOYALIST, BISHOP

By REGINALD V. HARRIS. Toronto: General Board of Religious Education, 1937. 186 pages. Cloth, \$1.25. Paper, \$1.00.

By a happy coincidence, two books upon the hitherto neglected career of the first bishop of Nova Scotia have appeared within the past year. John Wolfe Lydekker's *Life and Letters of Charles Inglis*, reviewed in an earlier issue of *Church History*, gave a full presentation of Inglis' early career, but ended with his elevation to the episcopate. The present work, in which

Dr. Harris was assisted by Archdeacon F. W. Vroom and the Rev. C. M. Serson, is a complete biography, but it deals most extensively with the period that began with Inglis' selection as the first colonial bishop of the Church of England. This was a period of greatest importance in the history of the Church of England in Canada, for Inglis exercised jurisdiction not only in Nova Scotia, but over Quebec, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland as well, so that his leadership was felt in the church throughout the eastern provinces. As the founder of King's College, Nova Scotia, he also fills an important niche in the history of Canadian education. His episcopal career is of at least secondary interest to students of church history in the United States, because of the number of loyalist clergymen who fled to Nova Scotia after the Revolution, and, consequently, ended their days under his jurisdiction. The authors, being officials of the diocese of Nova Scotia, have enjoyed special facilities for their work, and they have covered the subject very satisfactorily within the necessary limitations of a small volume.

The biography is supplemented by a number of appendices, including a list of Inglis' writings, a helpful chronology, biographical notes of varying length and value on most of the people mentioned in the text, and a reasonably extensive bibliography. It is to be wished that the authors had also supplied an index.

General Theological Seminary, New York City. William W. Manross.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF BISHOP WILLIAM WHITE

Edited by WALTER HERBERT STOWE. New York and Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1937. xiii, 306 pages. \$2.50.

William White was not only the father of the American Episcopal church, he was, during the era of the Revolution and for half a century beyond, one of the foremost citizens of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not to mention the United States. Hence this volume, which commemorates the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his consecration to the episcopate, should be of interest at once to Episcopalian and to all students of American history, religious or otherwise.

As a commemorative volume it contains the programs of the sesquicentennial celebrations held last February and the speeches made at that time. These will doubtless be of value to future historians as evidences of White's place in the thought of his admirers today. But for the historian of this age the valuable parts of the book, and the largest, are those which contain a selection of his letters and an account of his life. The latter is presented in five chapters, each by a different author.

The first, on White's ancestry and early life, is from a scarce life of the bishop by William Stevens Perry which appeared in *The Church Review* of 1887. The next two, which carry him through his consecration as bishop, are by Walter Herbert Stowe, the editor of the volume, and Louis C. Washburn. The fourth, on his episcopate, is by William Wilson

Manross, and fifth, on his work as a teacher, is by James Allen Montgomery. The first three of the five chapters quote so fully from the writings of White as to be essentially autobiographical. The other two are amply documented. At the end of the book is an excellent bibliography compiled by E. Clowes Chorley.

For a volume by so many hands a surprising unity is attained, due in part to the authors' common interest in the subject, but also to the admirable editing of Walter Herbert Stowe. The volume is, moreover, well printed and appropriately illustrated.

The Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. Muller.

THE SMALL SECTS IN AMERICA

By ELMER T. CLARK. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937. 311 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Elmer T. Clark, in *The Small Sects in America*, has succeeded in presenting the life-stories of the many small denominations in this country in an interesting, somewhat journalistic way. In his own denomination (M. E., South,) Dr. Clark, as Secretary of the Board of Missions, has distinguished himself as a promoter. Perhaps his war-time journalistic activity also is to be credited with having developed the correspondent's interest in making a good "story" out of normally prosaic facts. *The Small Sects in America* is based not only on its writer's personal investigations, but in no small measure upon the researches of others whose more specialized studies have been quoted, sometimes paraphrased, with a further use of the sources cited therein. The work is well documented; and the author has very profitably dipped into the periodical and pamphlet literature of the small sects, as well as made many direct observations through attendance on the meetings of these bodies. The resulting synthesis is a very effective one. Dr. Clark has shown an aptitude for selecting those data which have human interest, and has employed a simple, direct, unpadded form in his narrative.

By the way of criticism, it may be said that in places there would seem to be traces of a lack of appreciation for the integrity of some of these little religious bodies whose separation from the larger, more ossified groups is certainly symptomatic of failure somewhere. Occasionally the impression is left that the simple small-sect people believe as they do about worldliness, wealth and privilege purely because of a sour grapes attitude. The sincerity of hosts of these humble folk in their utter devotion to puritanical and pietistic ways of living, whether in prosperous or unprosperous times, is possibly not sufficiently taken into account in this work. This, however, is a matter of interpretation easily influenced by the background and denominational connections of the individual interpreter.

In organization of material Dr. Clark's book makes a distinct contribution to systematic thinking about these little denominations. The interpretative introductory material in each chapter is in the nature of historical background to each type; and the chapters on the Pessimistic Sects are particularly well introduced. Perhaps the most valuable chapters are the more

interpretative ones, I and VIII, the first of which generalizes about the total situation in American Protestantism with its many divisions, and cleverly classifies the small religious bodies in types; and the last of which contains a well-organized summary and characterization of these same bodies. Insight into the activities and psychology of the negro sects is particularly keen and stimulating (pp. 142-161).

All in all, the little volume is exceptionally comprehensive within its page limits, its story is picturesquely told, and its collected historical data and interpretations should be of special interest and value to all ministers and mature laymen who desire a rapid bird's-eye view of what is now undoubtedly the most significant portion of the American religious scene.

Central College, Fayette, Missouri.

Merrill E. Gaddis.

MENNONITE CYCLOPEDIC DICTIONARY

By DANIEL KAUFFMAN. Scottdale, Pa.; Mennonite Publishing House, 1937. 443 pages. \$2.00.

The contents of this book are explained in its title. The scope of the work is best stated in terms of the publisher's announcement, "A compendium of the doctrines, history, activities and environments of the Mennonite Church, especially in America. It brings together and makes available in alphabetical arrangement a wealth of information regarding events, Christian doctrines, institutions, conferences, families, and other items of interest to every Mennonite. One very interesting feature of the book is its nearly 1000 biographical sketches of Mennonite families of America; also four or five hundred places of historic interest are described." In addition to the dictionary proper there is also an appendix containing "Fifty Fundamental Facts" of doctrine, which, though expressing only the private opinions of the editor, yet states fairly accurately the doctrinal views of the great majority of the members of the church which he represents.

The editor, Rev. Daniel Kauffman, is well known in his church as editor of the *Gospel Herald*, official organ of the largest branch of the American Mennonites, writer of a number of books on the faith and history of Mennonites, and active in most of the affairs of his denomination.

This dictionary, which as the publishers state is the first of its kind in America, does not cover the whole field of Mennonitism, but confines itself almost exclusively to that branch of Mennonites in America sometimes known to historians of the denomination as "Old" Mennonites, though that is not the official title assumed by the denomination. This group which is the oldest of the American branches, and includes the early Pennsylvania settlements and most of their descendants in the states farther West, still embraces about one half of all the Mennonites in America. References to other branches in America, and to the Mennonites in Europe and other parts of the world, are merely incidental.

To those interested in the faith and practises, institutions, location

of settlements, and family names of this branch of the Mennonites, and also to such as are interested in Pennsylvania German genealogy, this book offers a wealth of concise information not easily found anywhere else.

Bluffton College, Bluffton, O.

C. Henry Smith.

CONSIDER THE LILIES HOW THEY GROW

By JOHN JOSEPH STOUDT, Allentown, Pa.: Schlechter's, 1937. 333 pages.

A folk art of remarkable extent has survived in Pennsylvania. Furniture, spinning-wheels, beds, barns, candlesticks, and tombstones are ornamented. Tulips, roses, eagles, doves, etc. are portrayed. What does it all mean? Outsiders have suggested that the devices on the barns are connected with witchcraft. The people themselves reject this interpretation, but they too have forgotten that the tulip-like flowers are really lilies, as appears from the verses accompanying the designs on some of the pieces. We are, therefore, in the region of the Lilies of the Valley and the Roses of Sharon, of mystical and apocalyptic religion. America was itself considered as a land in which the Lily should bloom anew. The tradition which produced this religious symbolism goes back through Conrad Beissel to Jacob Boehme, to the Mystical Sects of the Reformation, to the Spiritual Franciscans, and Joachim of Fiore, to Bernard of Clairvaux, to the Areopagite, Neoplatonism, and to the Old Testament.

The book combs the varied Pennsylvania material with diligence and sets forth the thesis as to its origin and meaning with persuasiveness. Dogmatism is impossible in such a field, but the main lines seem to me to be well established. A large religious background is exploited by way of illustration. The matter of the book is essentially sound. The form could be improved. Rearrangement would make the argument more immediately obvious. The style is sometimes diffuse. Bibliographies seldom include dates. There is no index. Typographical errors will be corrected in the market edition. References to the state-church type of Protestantism are not only critical—deservedly so—but sometimes ill informed.

All in all, the book is exceedingly illuminating for the religious life of a corner of our own land. The illustrations are choice.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

A MIGHTY WINNER OF SOULS: CHARLES G. FINNEY

By FRANK GRENVILLE BEARDSLEY. New York: American Tract Society, 1937. 192 pages. \$1.50.

Religion's approach to people has changed vastly within a century. We are leaving the era of revivals, but the period of Preaching Missions is flourishing. One hears less about the conversion of the soul, and more about the development of the personality. Indeed, "being religious" is more im-

portant than having "a religion." Much of which would have been highly shocking to one who was himself a disturber of institutional religion less than a century ago.

This book is written with one purpose in view: "that this brief study . . . may stimulate others to renewed effort in seeking to bring men to a saving knowledge of Him who is our Redeemer and Lord." It is a "Study in Evangelism" and throws the spotlight on the conversion of Finney, his revival campaigns, the opposition which developed, his pastorate at Broadway Tabernacle, and his connections with Oberlin. It is interesting to note that as a result of Finney's labours it was often the case that not only were souls saved but lives were transformed and revolutionized. Yet, in the face of problems which the church confronts today we should like to know what this devoted, unselfish man, who came into contact with so many thousands, thought of what was going on around him in this nation and throughout the world, and what were his connections with contemporary movements. This we do not get from this book, but it does portray Charles G. Finney as a "mighty winner of souls."

Bangor Theological Seminary.

Mervin M. Deems.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE NEBRASKA FRONTIER (1854-1885)

By SISTER M. AQUNATA MARTIN. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1937. ix, 202 pages.

The frontier conditions of Nebraska and the rôle that the Catholic church occupied is the theme of this monograph. One sees clearly that the pioneers were faced with many discouraging problems. On this frontier the Catholic priests performed a needed service. That the Catholic church was an influential institution is interestingly shown, but it would be better to show more definitely what proportion of the population was served. It is true that with the erection of the diocese of Omaha in 1885 the Catholic church entered a new era, but that the Nebraska frontier ended at that date is open to question. A map would be welcomed by any reader not familiar with the early local history. The facts given are reliable. Only one error was noted: the state capital was moved to Lincoln late in 1868, not in 1867 (page 104).

This history is treated in a scholarly manner except for one incident (pages 170-175). An annual letter to the Jesuit Provincial is quoted, which tells of the work among the Bohemians in Crete and the ill-feeling between the Catholics and Protestants. Other than calling this letter a "curious document," the author gives no explanation of this incident, and apparently made no attempt to verify the statement that public opinion finally resulted in the resignation and flight of the "moderator" of the college of a "certain sect." This is obviously Doane College, and such a resignation never occurred.

The numerous footnotes and lengthy bibliography add much to this

treatise. Some newspapers are used, but the main contemporary sources are letters and reports of mission activity, Catholic and Protestant. The book would be improved if the original letters had been used instead of the extracts printed in *The Home Missionary*. Yet, for definiteness and scholarly treatment this treatise is probably the best study yet made of social conditions of the Nebraska frontier, especially on the movement and character of the population. It is the only good history of the Catholic church in early Nebraska.

University of Wisconsin.

Charles J. Kennedy.

THE ARCHER OF PARADISE

By REVA STANLEY. Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1937. 349 pages.
\$3.00.

This book is the biography of Parley P. Pratt, one of the twelve original apostles of the Church of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as Mormons. Since Parley P. Pratt played such an influential rôle in the early days of Mormonism, this book is welcomed as an important addition to the rapidly growing literature on this subject.

The author has had full access to official records of the Mormon church and has based her story upon reliable source material. Herein we read of how the boy became attracted to Joseph Smith and how he developed into one of Smith's most trusted advisers. Pratt was sent on many important missions including two to Great Britain. He shared with others the distressing experiences of being forced by hostile states or communities to move from one place to another until finally the Mormons made the long trek to the Salt Lake Valley.

Parley P. Pratt had twelve wives and "upwards of twenty-five children." He was killed in Arkansas by a man who claimed that Pratt had induced his wife to leave him. The author points out that the feeling against Arkansas people was so strong among the Mormons as a result of Pratt's murder that it became a contributing factor to the Mountain Meadows massacre.

Reva Stanley, the author, is a great-granddaughter of Parley P. Pratt and writes with a very sympathetic attitude to the central figure of her story. She brings out the grudge that the Pratt family had against Brigham Young, who failed to share his financial gains with Pratt. She gives a justification of polygamy from the Mormon's viewpoint, and defends Pratt from the criticism of being "woman-crazy." She claims he was "gospel-crazy." On the whole the book is more friendly to the Mormon movement than critical.

The book is beautifully printed and bound in the usual Caxton manner of excellence.

Moscow, Idaho.

Clifford M. Drury.

HOLY MURDER

By CHARLES KELLY AND HOFFMAN BIRNEY. New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1934. 313 pages. \$3.00.

Even though several years have passed since this work first appeared, it deserves to be noticed in *Church History* because of the new light it throws upon Mormon history. The title is not a slang phrase, but rather is descriptive of the wholesale "murders" performed by a group of men in the Mormon church during its early days who were known as the Danites. The chief of these Danites was Porter Rockwell, also known as one of Brigham Young's "Destroying Angels" who slew in cold blood for the glory of the Mormon church.

The authors of *Holy Murder* have been well prepared by residence and experience as historians to write this book. Kelly is a well known author of western history books, while Birney is a novelist. This book is the first biography of Porter Rockwell to appear.

Undoubtedly Porter Rockwell was a man of ability. He was a leader, even though that leadership was inspired by fanaticism. He remained in the good graces of the highest officials of Mormonism while at the same time refusing to pay tithes, to enter into a polygamous marriage, and to abstain from intoxicating liquors. The secret of success in thus defying even Brigham Young himself is herein told. It is an ugly story, yet it is a part of the picture and should be told. "He killed," declare the authors on page 167, "only when so commanded by the high authorities of the church." The number of his victims have been variously estimated to be from a dozen to a hundred.

The book throws much new light upon the whole Mormon movement including such events as the Mountain Meadows massacre, the coming of the United States troops, and some modern aspects of Mormonism. At times the authors are perhaps too vitriolic in their biting criticisms, yet the procession of well authenticated facts which they marshall before the reader is most impressive. Every student of Mormonism should read this book.

Moscow, Idaho.

Clifford M. Drury.

MARCUS WHITMAN, M. D. PIONEER AND MARTYR

By CLIFFORD MERRILL DRURY. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, 1937. 473 pages. \$5.00.

Half a century ago when the Whitman controversy was raging it would have been taken for granted that a new life of the doctor by an Idaho Presbyterian minister would have been filled with arguments in support of the "Whitman-Saved-Oregon" thesis. Fortunately, as Dr. Drury shows in his useful sketch of the controversial literature on the subject

(Appendix 4), those days have passed, and the book under review is impartial and judicial in tone. On the central issue of the object of the famous ride across the continent in the winter of 1842-1843, the author takes the position that while the chief purpose was to save the mission from disruption by the American Board, Whitman was also concerned about American interests on the Columbia and probably visited Washington in order to suggest to United States authorities means by which emigration to the Oregon country might be encouraged; but the latter object alone would not have led him to make the long and perilous journey. As to the responsibility of the Catholic fathers for the massacre of 1847, Dr. Drury says that while their presence in the vicinity of the Waiilatpu mission at a time when the Indians were suspicious and angry may have fanned the flames, "the tragedy would surely have occurred if the Catholics had never been present."

Why then did the Indians kill two earnest Christian missionaries who devoted more than ten years to their service? Dr. Drury's answer, in part at least, is that Whitman, the forerunner of white civilization, was temperamentally unfitted to be a missionary to the Indians at a time when their old culture was about to be swept away. No question is raised as to Whitman's sincerity and devotion, but it is pointed out that in his latter years in Oregon, even while he was ministering faithfully to the bodies and spirits of the Indians, he had reached the conclusion that they were a doomed race. And as the natives came to feel that the white doctor was really more interested in his own people than in them, ignorance and fear drove them on to murder the man who was trying as best he could to prepare them for the changes they would soon be compelled to make in their mode of life. Quite clearly, however, not all Indians shared this feeling of resentment, but perhaps materials on which to base an adequate study of divergent opinions among the Cayuse and Nez Perce have gone forever.

This life of Whitman is factual, detailed, and well proportioned. Very properly Whitman's capable and courageous wife, Narcissa Prentiss, receives a great deal of attention in the narrative after her marriage—so much so that her name might appropriately have been included in the title. The work is based on a careful study of all available Whitman sources; although well documented, the student is at times left in uncertainty as to the location of some of the letters and diaries to which reference has been made (e. g., Parker letter, p. 100; Newell letter, p. 239; Spalding diary, p. 262; Crawford journal, p. 272). The pictures and sketches, illustrative of many phases of the lives of the Whitmans, are numerous and well chosen.

This is the second in a series of three volumes on three outstanding American Board pioneers in Oregon. Dr. Drury's *Henry Harmon Spalding* appeared two years ago; his life of Elkanah Walker is in preparation. In the Spalding volume a versatile and successful pioneer missionary was rescued from obscurity; in the present stimulating book Marcus and Narcissa Whitman are depicted as empire builders and martyrs to the cause of white civilization in the Northwest; the life of Walker will be awaited with interest.

University of Colorado.

Colin B. Goodykoontz.

APOSTLE OF CHINA
SAMUEL ISAAC JOSEPH SCHERESCHEWSKY, 1831-1906

By JAMES ARTHUR MULLER. New York: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1937.
279 pages. \$2.50.

Bishop Schereschewsky deserves a biography. His was an extraordinary life—because of the spiritual pilgrimage of his youth, his part in the early development of the China mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, his founding of St. John's University, and his enormous contributions to the translation of the Bible and of other Christian literature into Chinese. He was the more noteworthy because of the fact that much of his work of translation was done in his later years, when he was almost helpless physically from paralysis. Born a Jew, in Russian Lithuania, and designed for the post of Rabbi, in his early twenties he became a Christian, migrated to the United States, and, after being successively a Baptist and a Presbyterian, he established his religious home in the Protestant Episcopal Church. In 1859, in its pioneer days he joined the mission of his church in China. He possessed unusual linguistic gifts, was a prodigious worker, and early became a leading figure in the translation of the Bible. This work was partly interrupted by his election as bishop, an office which he most reluctantly accepted. At the age of fifty he was smitten with a disease which left him physically almost helpless but mentally alert. He returned to his task of translation, and pursued it until his death, in Tokyo, a quarter of a century later.

No extended biography has previously appeared. Fortunately Professor Muller has now provided us with so excellent a one that none other will ever be necessary. Professor Muller is experienced in the historical disciplines, for a time he lived in China, in Wuchang, where Bishop Schereschewsky had once resided, and he has been indefatigable in unearthing manuscript sources and in collecting oral first hand information. He writes well. He is a warm admirer of the bishop, but seldom allows his sympathy to warp his objectivity or to betray him into taking the rôle of an apologist. If there is a defect in the book it is in the lack of a sufficient portrayal of the scene, religious, cultural, and political, in the midst of which Schereschewsky worked and which forms the background essential to an understanding of his life.

Yale University.

K. S. Latourette.

LEO XIII AND OUR TIMES

By RENÉ FÜLOP-MILLER. Translated by Conrad M. R. Bonocena. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937. 202 pages. \$2.50.

The world which Leo faced at his accession was dominated by secularism. It manifested itself in theology and philosophy in the guise of rationalism. In the affairs of state, it took the form of anti-clericalism, and in sociology the extremes of Marxism and a false liberalism.

How Leo dealt with these problems is told by the author in this volume. He shows that the pontiff not only combated these forces in his own lifetime, but that he left to his successors a carefully formulated plan for restoring the church to its former position in world affairs. The key to the situation he found in the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. In a series of encyclicals based chiefly on Thomistic principles, Leo began his campaign. *Aeterni patris* brought out the true place of rational thought in the Catholic scheme of the universe, enlisting science in support of faith and marking out its sphere as against theology. *Sapientiae Christianae* along with other encyclicals enunciated the Catholic doctrine on the relations of church and state and did much to enhance the prestige of the Holy See. In *Rerum novarum* the aged pontiff, continuing to use Thomistic principles, sought to solve the complex social problems of the time. In the final chapter the author shows that Leo's ideas and practical lines of action continue to give direction to Vatican policies today.

Criticism must be made with regard to the make-up of the book. Had the author included a preface, he would have done much to help the reader grasp his thesis. In addition, the fact that he has omitted all documentation lessens the value of the work for the serious student. The bibliography is extensive but it is confined almost entirely to German works. The author, however, has succeeded in presenting an objective study of the Catholic position with reference to all the important questions of modern times.

St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown, Pa.

J. P. McGowan, C. M.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN ITALIAN THOUGHT FROM CAOUR TO MUSSOLINI

By S. WILLIAM HALPERIN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937. 115 pages. \$2.00.

This is a useful survey of the history of the relations between church and state in Italy during the last hundred years. The best part of the exposition is the account of the attempt by the Right Wing liberals to create a "free church in a free state." The declining fortunes of this formula, as it was attacked successively by the Clericals, the Left, and the Fascists, constitute the chief theme of the story. The author somewhat disarms the critic by announcing in the Preface that "the specific issues," including "the Roman question, are outside the scope of this study . . . and are being reserved for special treatment." If this book is "concerned only with the theoretical discussion," its exposition of them is not theoretical enough. In fact, the Roman question generally is in the foreground. Much of the material is repetitious journalism and political rhetoric with a minimum of theoretical value, but even where significant social theories are involved, as in the cases of Giannone, Gioberti, Spaventa, and Gentile, the general philosophical frameworks are given inadequate exposition. Especially in the discussion of "antiseparatist cross-currents" it would have been instructive had the author distinguished more clearly those writers who were inspired by the anti-clericalism of the French Revolution and by French positivism

from those who derived their ideas from German idealism and the *Kulturkampf*. From this point of view pages 42 to 45 are confusing.

Similarly the various theoretical backgrounds and implications among the Fascist writers are not distinguished. The reader, who has been told that Fascism aimed to put an end to the Roman question and that Gentile was Fascism's most authoritative philosopher of religion, must be surprised to read that according to Gentile no permanent peace between church and state is possible. The conflicting viewpoints of the Hegelians (Gentile), the Nationalists (Alfredo Rocco), and the Syndicalists (the youthful Mussolini) make an illuminating account of Fascist theory somewhat complicated. It is to be hoped that Professor Halperin will carry his analysis beyond 1929, for the "conflict after the reconciliation" (cf. Vincenzo Morello) is one of the most interesting chapters of this story.

Columbia University.

Herbert W. Schneider.

KARL BARTH'S IDEA OF REVELATION

By PETER HALMAN MONSMA. Somerville, N. J.: Somerset Press, Inc., 1937. 218 pages. \$2.00.

The main content of this doctor's dissertation of Columbia University is an exposition and analysis of Karl Barth's idea of revelation as it is contained in the first part of his *Church Dogmatics* of 1932. This work is cautiously and understandingly done. It is preceded by a description of Barth's theological development which does not add anything new to what other authors have already established and expounded, but which has the distinction of being more extensive and fuller of detail than earlier interpretations. The last part of the book contains a criticism of Barth's concept of revelation.

Dr. Monsma emphasizes the Barthian principle of the discontinuity between God and man as inadequate for a full comprehension of the content of revelation. He indicates also that what appears in Barth's teaching as a theological principle must really be understood as a philosophical one. Moreover, he justly points out that Karl Barth's own faith cannot possibly be what it should be, according to his own theological assertions.

The weakness of Dr. Monsma's work lies chiefly in the fact that he has not dealt with the Christian theological tradition in a manner which would be truly illuminating. He concerns himself much with those who have exercised direct influence upon Barth, but he does not understand the Barthian theology in the light of the problems which have emerged in the course of Protestant thinking, particularly in recent times. In his measurement of Barth's thought on the work of his father, for instance, Dr. Monsma goes to extremes which in my opinion are not justified.

While the book adds nothing to our present knowledge of Barth, it must be appreciated as a careful estimate and exposition of his fundamental line of thought.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

W. Pauck.